ERIC Document Resume	See Instruction Sheet	DATE OF RESUME 7/3/65	DATE RECEIVED

A. PUBLICATION DATA

1. ERIC NUMBER	2. ORIGINATOR CONTROL NO(S).	3. IDENTIFICATION NO.	DO NOT WRITE IN SPACE BELOW
ED000870	8422		

4. AUTHOR(S): N.A.

5. TITLE OF DOCUMENT ABSTRACTED: Development Institute: Selected Papers from the 1961 ACPRA Summer Institute for College Development Officers, Volume 3

6. PUBLICATION TITLE: N.A.

7. EDITOR(S): N.A.

8. PLACE OF ORIGIN: ACPRA
ORG. 1785 Mass. Ave., NW
ST. Washington, DC 20036
CITY, STATE

9. PUBLISHER OR SOURCE: American College Public Relations Ass.

10. VOL.	11. PAGES	12. MO./YR.	13. TOTAL PP.
3	N.A.	June 62	71

TELE. EXT.
INST/LOC CODE

MICROFILM COPY AVAILABLE: YES ☒ NO ☐

COPYRIGHT GRANTED: YES ☐ NO ☒

COPYRIGHT RELEASE FILED: YES ☐ NO ☐

TYPE OF REPORT: PROPOSAL ☐ IN-PROGRESS ☐ FINAL ☒ FOLLOW-UP ☐

OTHER ERIC REFERENCES:

ERIC SATELLITE CODE

B. INDEXING DATA

14. SUBJECT AREA

15. TYPE OF ENDEAVOR: conference

16. INDEXING TERMS (6-12)

conferences R-32	administration R-06	consultants R-38		
development G-05	personnel P-09	school-community relations Y-02		
planning P-15	finances G-31			

17. ABSTRACT (MAX. 250 WORDS)

The nine papers presented in this publication deal mainly with the planning and justification of development programs; sources of financial support such as alumni, corporate giving and special donors; the relationship of trustees, governing boards, and other segments of the institution to the development program; and the use of professional fund-raising counsel. Four of the five authors have held executive positions with the American College Public Relations Association, and all served as members of the Institute faculty.

ERIC No.

18. SOURCE OF ABSTRACT

C. FUNDING DATA

19. SUPPORTING ORGANIZATION	20. DIVISION OR DEPT.	21. CONTRACT NO. / PROJECT NO.
	22. TOTAL COST OF PROJECT	
	23. DURATION OF PROJECT	U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Office of Education

R-7-17
X 1, 10

8422

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

DEVELOPMENT INSTITUTE

Selected papers from the 1961 ACPRA Summer Institute for College Development Officers

VOLUME 3 OF THREE VOLUMES

ED000870

DEVELOPMENT INSTITUTE

Selected papers from the 1961 Summer Institute for College Development Officers, held July 8-15, 1961 on the campus of Colorado College, Colorado Springs, Colorado

Volume 3 of three volumes

Published by

The American College Public Relations Association

1785 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.

Washington 6, D.C.

Washington, D.C. June, 1962

INSTITUTE FACULTY

W. NOEL JOHNSTON, Director of the 1961 Institute as well as the two preceding ACPRA Summer Institutes, is Vice President for University Relations at Ohio Wesleyan University. He served as Executive Director of ACPRA from 1956 to 1959 and has held development and public relations positions at Pratt Institute, Johns Hopkins University, and Goucher and Evansville Colleges.

W. R. BROSSMAN, Vice President of Colorado College since 1956, was previously Director of Publicity for Allegheny College and Director of Public Information at Cornell University. Before entering the college public relations and development field, he was sports editor for the Tribune newspapers in Meadville, Pa.

JAMES W. JACKSON, JR. is Executive Vice President of the American College Public Relations Association. Prior to his association with ACPRA, he held public relations and development positions with William and Mary, Rollins, Davidson and Mary Baldwin Colleges and Washington University, St. Louis.

FRANCIS C. PRAY, Vice President, Operations Administration for the Council for Financial Aid to Education, Inc. since 1958, was formerly head of the public relations program at the University of Pittsburgh. He is a past President of ACPRA.

ARTHUR J. SCHAEFER, Vice President for Development and Public Relations at DePaul University, is the 1961-62 President of ACPRA. Before assuming his present position in 1955, he was associated with DePaul as college instructor, Director of Public Relations and Director of Development.

CONTENTS

Planning the Development Program. 5
James W. Jackson, Jr.

Building the Case for Your Institution - Some Considerations 16
Francis C. Pray

The Specific Alumnus. 25
W. R. Brossman

Company Giving 33
Arthur J. Schaefer

Going for the Big Ones - The Special Gift 38
Arthur J. Schaefer

The College and University Relations in the Development Program. 46
W. Noel Johnston

Trustees and Governing Boards and Your Development Program - Some Considerations. 51
Francis C. Pray

Professional Fund Raising Counsel 56
W. R. Brossman

Action: Putting into Effect Development Knowledge. 64
James W. Jackson, Jr.

PREFACE

Papers of this publication were presented at the 1961 Development Institute of The American College Public Relations Association, held at Colorado College, Colorado Springs, Colorado, July 8-15, 1961.

They were written with the idea of stimulating discussion among the "students" of the institute, most of whom were newcomers to the field of institutional development and public relations. They have not been edited for this publication, but appear as originally presented.

This is the third of three volumes of similar presentations. The papers presented at the Institute of 1959 were published in November, 1961; the 1960 papers were published in January. These volumes are furnished to the membership of ACPRA at no additional charge.

PLANNING THE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

JAMES W. JACKSON, JR.

Just before this meeting began, my family and I ascended the two-hundred step stairway at Seven Falls, in the Cheyenne Mountain Canyon. It was an arduous task, and the top seemed more distant as we climbed, each step more difficult. Not until we looked back, counted the steps and realized how far we had come did the effort seem effective ---- an experience similar to that of a development director viewing his own program. The realization of progress is elusive to those intimately involved in the effort.

A successful development program can have several definitions. Fran Pray has a definition which goes something like this: "An institution has a successful development program when it has identified, informed and stirred to action all of those persons who can make a significant contribution to its chosen mission."

Another definition worth considering has been made by Don Smith, Vice President for University Relations and Development at the University of Rochester: "A successful development program is justified, organized, dignified asking, within an environment of understanding and respect."

Paul H. Davis has noted that institutions must have two key criteria if they are to succeed. These are: (1) bold, exciting plans, soundly managed, and (2) an outstanding board of trustees. Mr. Davis further says that among those institutions which he has visited, and he has visited more than 200 within the last several years, he notices three common characteristics: they know where they are, where they have been, and where they are going; they are able to relate these plans in simple, specific terms; they believe, and the constituency believes, and with a transcending fervor that sets them apart from other institutions.

Frank Ashmore has noted that there are perhaps three key groups in any institution, the students, the faculty, and the supporters, and that it is the job of the development program to serve as a catalyst, bringing these three groups together. The development program must inform, must motivate and must provide a mechanism for support. He noted criteria for success as follows:

1. An institution must have a purpose which is common, clear, important, and urgent.

2. There must be general agreement on the program which will fulfill this purpose.

3. There must be an acceptance of responsibility by each and by all of these three groups.

4. The institution must have the capacity for achieving this purpose.

5. Each group must have confidence in the other groups.

These are definitions of successful development programs. Now, let's turn to the officer, the chief development, public relations, or advancement officer of this program. Samuel B. Gould, former President of Antioch College, a former development director, and currently the President of the University of California at Santa Barbara, says that the first step in a successful public relations or development program is the acquisition by the public relations officer of a sensitive awareness of his institution's educational philosophy and a dedicated belief in this philosophy. He says that the successful development officer must first of all know his institution -- know it thoroughly, and know higher education, thoroughly. And that he must know both to such an extent that he can become enthusiastic about them.

Second, he must have the ability to speak about the objectives honestly, without reservation (and knowledge precedes this). He says that the successful development officer should ground himself in the history and the progress of higher education. He must attend faculty and academic committee meetings as an observer, and he must steep himself in every possible educational element of the institution. He must know the institution and its role.

Robert E. Nelson, who has been associated with small colleges and is now Vice Chancellor of the University of Kansas City, calls the role of the development officer a coordinating function, bringing together elements of the program. Nelson says that the development officer must be more than a technician, even more than a statesman. He must know the techniques of public relations, communications, fund raising and related activities; he must also know education, and the processes in education which will best contribute to his institution's goal. Nelson says that each institution must have an educational blueprint and overall plan; that continuous self study is essential because faculty contributions and interest are sporadic -- that the faculty usually does not have the time or the interest to do this continuous self study of its own volition. He further states that the faculty must respect the development program; this is essential. The development program must speak the language of the faculty.

Dr. Edgar B. Cale, the Vice Chancellor for Planning and Development at the University of Buffalo, also subscribes to the role of the development officer as a coordinating officer, and sees the development program not only as furnishing a mechanism and furnishing leadership, but as coordinating these functions throughout the institution and its constituency.

We must therefore establish channels within the institution for communication. We must bridge the gap between the internal and the external, as an educator, as a technician, and under a master plan which is more than acceptable, and which reflects the emotions and the enthusiasm of the constituencies within the institution.

References for this, incidentally, include the paper by President Gould, "Broader Horizons for Interpreting Education," a reprint from PRIDE, the ACPRA magazine. Also, Dr. Cale's paper, "The Coordinating Officer: A Review of Fundamentals," a reprint from PRIDE. Also, the book, "Some Aspects of Educational Fund-Raising," available to members of ACPRA engaged in educational development. It contains addresses from the 1960 joint national convention of ACPRA and the American Alumni Council.

If we have identified the role of development and the role of the officer, the next step is planning, both for long range and short range operation. It is probable that most institutions engage primarily in short range planning to meet the emergencies of the day, rather than develop first a long range plan into which short range plans can fit. This is natural since, if the institution needs money, it needs money today to balance the budget. If a dormitory burns down that dormitory must be replaced. If you must increase enrollment to attain a sound operating basis you must have more space for the students or an increase is impossible. So too many institutions, too many of us, are often guilty of the short range view without the long range. Sound short range planning is also fundamental.

Who does the planning? Some call in the planning authority, the management expert, as described in the book, "Long Range Planning for Colleges and Universities." At one major institution, the head of the development program, which includes public relations, alumni relations, fund raising and communications, is called the director of planning. At another major institution, the director of campus planning has no part in the development program. Who does the planning is up to the institution,and a good case can be made for any number of methods. But it is certainly the duty and the responsibility of the development program to see that planning is accomplished. There are many views, but traditionally educators have felt that planning is an academic function, or has roots in the academic, and should stem from the trustees and the faculty. Beardsly Ruml disagrees in Memo To A College Trustee, and gives sound reasons. In any event the development officer plays a leading role.

What are the steps in planning? I should list them as follows. First of all, to know the role and the responsibility of higher education in the world today. Two, to know the role of our own institution -- how it fits into higher education everywhere, and what our own peculiar place is. Three, to conduct a critical, perhaps even a cold evaluation and analysis of our institution. (Perhaps one of our largest sins is being prejudiced in favor of our own institution, to preach excellence though we are not excellent when

measured against the best. We must be cold, we must be critical, and we must be willing to conduct repeated self-analyses.)

Four and five might be taken together. Four is to produce a "statement of the case." As Paul Davis says, we must state plans in simple specific terms; we must make the case for our institution. And perhaps simultaneously with this, we must conduct a long range budget projection. The book "Financing Higher Education, 1960-70", contains a chapter by Sydney Tickton of the Ford Foundation on the long range budget projection. It describes how one institution, not hypothetical incidentally, conducted such a projection. I know of another institution whose dean, treasurer and vice president for development, took off three weeks in January and February, worked seven days a week, eighteen hours a day for those three weeks, did not even go in their offices except on Sunday morning, and came up with a 100 page statement of the case and long range budget projection. That's the way one institution, a medium-size private college, accomplished it.

Step six is perhaps the most vital of all, the measurement of potential -- not just what our potential is, but what it will be and what it can be. We must keep in mind that in the typical capital fund campaign one per cent of the constituency gives more than fifty per cent of the gifts, and that ten per cent gives ninety per cent. When we have identified this top ten per cent we have taken a long step toward accomplishing our long range planning. We should also keep in mind that among the more successful institutions, trustees give approximately one-third, or thirty per cent. Non-alumni special prospects give about sixty-five per cent, alumni about twenty-five per cent, and foundations and corporations combined, only about fifteen per cent.

This adds up to about 125%, -- barely enough, if we get it all.

Step seven: determine the cost, the financing of the long range program.

There are a number of theories on cost, two of which stand out. One is that the cost of the development program should be borne out of the annual operating budget of the institution. Another, that a percentage of the future gifts should be taken to finance the acquisition of gifts. We can take one or the other or a combination of the two, whichever fits our institution best. Paul Davis predicts that the successful institutions in the sixties will be budgeting from ten to fifteen per cent of their total gift income to finance programs.

Number eight is <u>time</u>. This is the factor, of course, which determines <u>exactly</u> what we are going to do whether it is long range or short range. We can rarely wait for the ideal length of time. For instance, it has been estimated that bequests have furnished up

to ninety per cent of the endowment of America's colleges and universities; but it's a little difficult, if not illegal, to hasten a bequest program. You can get the prospects but getting their gifts is something else. We must compromise the ideal with the necessary, bend the short and long range needs to fit one another.

Number nine is staffing. As Ashmore states, you can determine the best of programs, but unless you have the capacity, which would include personnel, for completing such a program, there's not much point in going into it. Incidentally, I know one very prominent vice president for development who once administered a development program with some forty staff members, divided into all the various functions of institutional planning and development. Then he moved to a similarly large institution, and will not have a staff of more than six because he wants to keep in close touch with these people. Of course, one real virtue of this is that the cost of acquiring gifts remains low. For that particular institution it is approximately one per cent of the gift income. Just what size and type staff is desirable can be determined only after deciding what job needs to be done, and when. Most institutions need development staffs larger than they now have, but size and competence aren't the only answers.

Number ten, sales. Once we have our plans we must sell them. We must sell them internally as well as externally. And even if our faculty participates in planning, and the plan reflects the will of the faculty, the will of the trustees, the will of the other administrative officers, remember that these faculties, and all of these constituencies, continually change; they are not static. Plans must be sold internally as well as externally.

Step eleven, evaluation. We must conduct continual evaluation and reporting. Even the most thorough plans lose something unless they are flexible; we are in a transitional era. All of us should read, if we have not read, the article by Paul H. Davis. "Change, Move, or Perish," pointing out that those institutions which do not change or move, and thence escape from the bounds of tradition, may perish in the sixties.

After we have gone through these eleven steps in planning, after we know our own roles and the roles of the development program, then perhaps we move into the identification, the informing and the involvement of our constituencies.

Now what is the total constituency of the typical institution? We might divide constituencies into three groups. First the internal: faculty, students, administration and trustees. How do we inform these groups? Certainly by committee and by personal contact, probably supplemented by publications, keeping in mind that these groups are effective channels to the outside.

A second constituency combines the internal and external. It is external, but it has channels, or should have channels, into the internal operation of the institution. Included are alumni, parents, the church (if we are a church-related institution), the community in which we are located, and special individuals, for we seek to involve special prospects within our trustees, or within the alumni, and perhaps within the administration.

The third constituency is one which you might call a source group for support -- government, corporations, and foundations.

How do we inform these constituencies? Is not personal communication twenty times as effective? Is not personal solicitation in fund raising twenty times as effective as direct mail solicitation? But do you not need the direct mail information program to precede the personal solicitation, if it is to be effective? There is certainly no substitute for personal communication. For trustees, committee action is essential, as are periodic meetings on or off the campus. For the faculty, certainly committee action is needed for both information and involvement. I am reminded of one institution which came up with one of the most beautiful of long range plans using the best principles of management of business and industry. It included cutting the faculty by one third so that the other faculty salaries could be raised, and so that the institution could really perform a program of excellence. This program was presented; within a year the faculty had rebelled and had fired the president -- beautifully and effectively, with the help of an outside public relations agency. At another institution the faculty did not speak to the administration and neither spoke to the athletic department; this preceded resignation by the top seventeen administrative officers.

There are happy stories too. For instance, at two small colleges both faculty and trustees gave, 100 per cent, to the development program in one year. The size of the gift in this case is not particularly important. At another institution, the faculty took active part in successfully concluding a capital funds campaign by telephoning long distance to alumni who had not sent in their gifts. These faculty members could hardly have performed this function if they had not first of all been informed of and had not taken part in a plan of action, and had become involved in more ways than fund raising.

There is the theory being advanced at at least one major university that the development function should be only a part of the total faculty function, and that the chief development officer should be beneath the dean of the institution, the provost, or whatever the title of the chief academic officer. This serves to make the faculty more and more responsible, and more and more a part of the development program. But unless the faculty is involved, by committee action, and informed by some method, preferably personal communication and by literature, the chances of success with the faculty (which is the heart of the institution) are not good.

With the students, many institutions miss a pretty good bet. I remember one national convention of ACPRA when an hour's program centered around the topic of how an institution can get highway signs advertising its presence, a worthwhile thing to do. At Austin College in Texas the president of the student body and several other students with permission from the institution accomplished this by themselves --- just one case in which the students were used effectively. I am sure that those students became a very vital force in the development of that college.

We are aware of bad examples, where students have not been taken into the confidence of the planning of the administration and have rebelled: in assembly programs, in the student newspaper largely, and in other ways.

Certainly we must be aware of the responsibility and the role of the other administrative officers in conducting long range planning. It is possible that the majority of us who have administered development programs have had trouble in coordinating gift records with business officers. There's an overlap of functions, and misunderstanding almost inevitably develops. So surely we should try to bring in other officers and factors of the administration into the planning process.

Most institutions have alumni on their governing boards, to voice the feeling of that constituency which never changes. The trustees change, the faculty changes, the student body changes, the officers of the administration change, but the alumni change little. And so it has clearly a larger stake than most "publics" in the administration and planning of an institution. It has also been said that no constituency has a keener interest in a particular institution -- hopefully for four years -- than the parents, and surely we should attempt to capitalize upon this intense interest at least during the period that the parents have students in the institution.

Our churches, too, have a stake in the institution, especially if they are not educated to the original basis upon which many church colleges were established, that the college is a contribution of the church to society. Of course this can be debated, and is, too much. We must recognize that the denomination which our institution represents has a voice in or should have a voice in the long range planning and the goal and objectives of our institution. This is not to say it should rule or decide, but it should be heard ... and it should be informed.

Surely the community in which the institution is located has a stake in what we do. Personal communication is far easier than the amount practiced would indicate. Too many of us depend upon mass media for the total communication with the community. I know of one institution which the treasurer of the city had walked past every day, twice a day, for forty years. His wife was a graduate of the institution. And until that institution had a luncheon for

businessmen of the community he had never set foot on the campus. He also happened to be an officer of the church which had founded the institution. No wonder the institution felt it was not understood or supported by community or church!

As the community develops a master plan, it will likely overlap with the master plan of the institution, particularly if the institution must expand to take care of its students. And I suppose that a number of us have become acquainted with the problem of decreasing taxable property within a city or county or state because it becomes tax exempt as part of the educational program of the institution. Yet I wonder how many of us are guilty of the sin of omission of failing to let the community know exactly what an asset to the community an institution is or can be? President Pusey of Harvard can cite impressive facts. Another institution figures that since a college education adds approximately $150,000 to the expected income of a graduate, and since it has 15,000 graduates in the community, it has therefore become a multi-billion dollar asset to that community! Have you ever listed the contributions of your institution to your community?

Special prospects -- the top ten per cent -- may be relatives or may be persons we wish to bring into our constituency for work, wealth or wisdom. It's well to bear in mind, I think, what a Princeton trustee calls the "Willie Sutton plan." You'll remember Willie Sutton was confined in jail after many colorful years as a bank robber, when one reporter asked him "Willie why did you rob all those banks?" And he replied, "because that's where the money is." Princeton doesn't spend a preponderance of time, but does spend some time, in identifying the wealthiest families in the United States and any tenuous connection that the institution might have with these wealthy families.

As far as government is concerned, certainly this is going to be an increasingly important source of support, whether or not we like the idea of federal or state aid. The Atomic Energy Commission, the National Science Foundation, as well as local and state governments are becoming increasingly interested in and desirous of supporting higher education. We know that we can now have student centers financed by federal loans, as well as classrooms and dining halls. Government will be in the sixties, in our educational emergency, an increasingly important part of our constituency.

Corporations in the past have not contributed a large percentage of the support of higher education. Of the 900,000 identified corporations of the United States only 35,000 of them have known philanthropic programs. If CFAE and all of us interested in furthering corporate support of higher education can succeed, corporate support of higher education will comprise by 1970 or before, one quarter of all support of higher education. We must be aware of corporations, what they are for, why they should give and how we might make our case to them so that they might give. Another sig-

nificant point is that those institutions making the best case for corporate support are receiving it.

It is by design that foundations are mentioned last, because I believe that of all the sources of support of higher education, foundations have been the most overestimated by most institutions. Among those institutions represented at this institute, I think it is safe to say that less than five per cent of our total gift income in the sixties will come from foundations, perhaps excluding family foundations through which some special prospects will make their gifts. The time spent on foundations to a great extent might best be spent in some other area. This is not to say we should overlook foundations, because they are important. If we have a program which the foundations might respond to, then of course we should go to the foundations. To become educated on them, there is no better place than the Foundation Library Center which is, I believe, at 585 Fifth Avenue in New York City. A day's study there, and the use of professional consultants can also save us time and money.

SUMMARY

Our Constituencies:

Trustees, faculty, students and administration: internal.

Alumni, parents, church, community and special prospects: a combination of internal and external.

Government, corporations and foundations: external.

The best means of communication, of informing and involving, perhaps the only really effective means, is by personal communication. Gould describes in his paper some of the steps he went through in successfully conducting a development program. I should like to quote him: ". . . . I found myself persuading and cajoling the faculty into the creation of the broadest kind of statement of the purposes of a university -- not just our university, but any university. They responded eventually with a magnificent and eloquent document which was debated up hill and down dale in all the schools and departments of the university until the degree of concentration upon the total educational process rose to new heights." And again: ". . . . It wasn't easy. I recall meeting dozens of times each year and in dozens of places with alumni groups. In each instance I talked almost entirely of our educational philosophy, our objectives, our innovations, our plans -- not football."

And again: "It is the permeation of the educational philosophy into all the particular aspects of public relations work that makes this officer a coordinator. And in all this coordination,

he surrounds himself with a self-effacing quality and a willingness to involve others not only in what they shall do but in the credit they shall receive.

Remember the much-criticized study conducted for the Chicago Tribune and reprinted in Newsweek, in which the top ten institutions in various categories were listed? Being an alumnus of Davidson College, which was not among the survey's top ten liberal arts collegs for men (even though we are, in reality), I was one who criticized this study. But there was one significant point which came from it, and that was, that the chief criterion used in evaluating institutions was its ethos -- what the internal constituencies, or the alumni who came from that institution, or those who lived and worked there thought about it. A mistake? Perhaps. But a real belief, Paul Davis' transcending belief, in the program and purposes of that institution is all-important.

At the beginning I compared the ascent of a steep mountain with a development effort, the backward glance can be rewarding. And there are other reflections in this analogy:

(1) We were almost repelled at the gate because of an unexpectedly high cost of admission.

(2) Had we known in advance how difficult the climb would be, we might never have made it.

(3) After we reached the top, we felt the expense and exertion were worthwhile.

(4) En route, one of the children needed coaxing and cajoling, and sought to lean on his parents.

(5) Another child, older and confident, kept running off by himself.

(6) As we climbed we knew that we must keep on the trail, following the example of those who had gone before; a misstep could be serious, perhaps fatal.

We ascended that particular mountain, but we could look all around us and see higher peaks, of this range and of other ranges. We knew that in other parts of the Rockies there were higher mountains, and that in other parts of North America some rise higher still. And we know that if we cross the ocean, to the Himalayas or Alps, there are peaks two, three, or four times the height of the one which we ascended.

We gain satisfaction in that we see, in our accomplishment, the magnificent beauty of the valley below, the peaks around us, and the walls that we had scaled. And we know there is always a loftier goal for mankind.

BUILDING THE CASE FOR YOUR INSTITUTION - SOME CONSIDERATIONS

FRANCIS C. PRAY

We have just heard how one of our colleagues in this Institute went about making plans for a trip to the West Coast. First he and his family decided on their objectives. Then they looked at maps and decided on the best routes. Then they looked over their resources. They provided an adequate vehicle, in this case a new car. And they started out.

It just occurs to me that these are exactly the steps that the college or university takes in defining its case and mounting a development program, except that this family took the steps and the average college or university never does.

There is an excellent example of one approach in the text which you have been furnished - the piece by Signey Tickton*
I recommend it to you for intensive study.

Let's look at this problem of building a case for an institution. How do we begin?

I suggest we begin by seeking our own answers to the soul-searching question put recently by Frank Ashmore when he asked, "If your institution were suddenly wiped off the face of the earth would there be any compelling need, any rush of enthusiasm, to rebuild it just as it is and doing the same thing that it's doing now?"

This is a blunt and shocking question. It demands that we look at our colleges with a different kind of perspective. It demands some soul searching. And most of all it demands a tough kind of objectivity as we look at our institution.

Think of your campus and how warm and friendly it looks. Recall the beautiful contrast photographs you get of the campus tower against the dark blue sky. Just perfect, isn't it?

But wait a moment. Imagine you're suddenly transported vertically. You go up into the stratosphere and you look down and your campus has suddenly shrunk in size. You see hundreds of people and thousands of automobiles running around. You begin to wonder how many people care much about your campus. And now you get up so high you see the whole state your campus is in. You see people being solicited by community funds and by health drives. And you see

---

*"Long-range Planning: A Case Study." Sidney G. Tickton, a chapter in Financing Higher Education 1960-70, ed. by Dexter M. Keezer, McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc. 1959.

people worried about their houses and their mortgages and fighting traffic getting to work, and getting ahead, and you begin to wonder just how many really care about your college. And you see down there scores of other campuses and hundreds of schools and thousands of homes and thousands of mortgages and it just begins to be borne in upon you for the first time that maybe there isn't any automatic justification after all for your institution. And you recall that when a reservoir is built and a town is flooded most people seem to find a new place to live. And don't most people, if they can't go to one college, adjust pretty well to another?

Suppose your college were wiped out, all its records, all its students transferred to other colleges, all its faculty finding other jobs in some other institution, what difference would it make? Would it make any difference at all? Would it make any difference at all to your state, to America, to society, if your institution were wiped out?

Most probably even in the state where you live a lot of people have never heard of your institution. In Michigan, when a sample of the people were asked to name any Michigan colleges, 8 percent could not and 33 percent could name only three or fewer. And remember that Michigan is a state almost completely saturated with news of higher education.

Presidents sometimes come into my office in New York and say something like this, "We've got a project, a new building. Where can we go in New York to get the $50,000 we need to get this over the hump?"

Of course if I knew where there was $50,000 I would have been there earlier. But I'm not brutal about my answer. I ask the president if he's built up a case for his institution, or considered his alumni contacts, or studied his resources, or looked into his own community.

My unspoken answer would go something like this. "No, Mr. President, I don't know where you can go to get $50,000 for your institution. I don't know who should care. I don't know why you'd want them to care. Tell me who cares about your institution and <u>why</u> they should care, and I'll tell you where you might start looking for the money."

Actually, I could add that if the president knew who cared he probably wouldn't be in my office looking for that $50,000 because he would know where to go for that support.

---

*"Third Report ... The Public's Picture of Higher Education in the State of Michigan: Information, Evaluation, and Enrollment Plans." Survey conducted by Survey Research Center, University of Michigan. 1960.

Now is there a case for your college? Of course there is, for most colleges. The tragedy is that most colleges have never thought it through or faced the implications if they have thought it through.

What is your role in developing the case for your institution? First, as the development officer you must understand the big case. You must understand the case for higher education itself; internationally, as a part of the progress of humanity, and nationally, as part of our American system. That means you must read a lot and reflect a lot and understand a lot.

We'll assume that you know the case for higher education in America. Your next job is to understand and help prepare the case for your own institution.

What are some elements of writing the case?

First you might start with a statement of simple mission. It's surprising how few colleges can state their simple mission. Randolph-Macon College for Women had a simple mission when it was founded. Its simple mission was to educate young women in its immediate area.

A complex university might say that its simple mission is to create, preserve and pass on knowledge. A college might exist to prepare teachers. A liberal arts college might conceivably serve the simple mission of preparing alert, well-oriented citizens, grounded in fundamental knowledge and constructive attitudes, and aimed at graduate and professional schools.

If your college should disappear, what simple mission would have to be fulfilled by some other institution? What simple mission does it have?

Many an institution has spent many months and mobilized the best efforts of its faculty, trustees, administration, alumni and students in the effort to reach agreement on this statement. Agreement in the simple mission is prerequisite to the process of developing the case in depth.

This statement of simple mission - I'm using the words on purpose, simple mission - begins to give us some insight into the next set of questions we need to ask as we continue preparation of the case.

What are some of these questions?

CONTROL. Why not begin with some questioning of the basic nature of control of the college itself? In another paper I have noted the necessity to examine the top governing authority as a prerequisite to total institutional development. Do we have too much

state control to attain our simple mission? Are our relationships with the Church the proper ones to enable us to achieve our simple mission? Is an independent board of trustees the way we can operate best to fulfill our simple mission?

Why make a first assumption that the institution is restricted by its present charter if that charter stands in the way of accomplishment of the agreed-upon mission? Charters have been changed when a simple mission has been defined and each aspect of the college measured against that.

QUALITY: What kind of quality should be sought to meet the requirements of the simple mission? Everybody talks about quality and character building. But the thing that makes some colleges distinctive is that they are different than the average. What kind of quality aspirations are you going to have? Is your institution going to be a Harvey Mudd, taking nothing but the very top students in science, or are you going to be a Parsons College, taking students who have busted out of college in other places in order to give them a second chance at higher education? These are both reputable objectives, but the college has to decide -- what level of quality?

CURRICULUM PHILOSOPHY: What kind of curriculum philosophy? Are you going to be liberal arts, and mean it? Or should you have evening courses in commercial science? What should be the complex of graduate and professional schools added - or subtracted - to attain the success of the simple mission?

LOCATION: I would even suggest that the college might well examine its location. Too many just assume that because they're there that's where they ought to be. Skidmore College is going to move its whole campus and strengthen its philosophy of education in a new climate of architecture. Colby College in Waterville, Maine, was trapped by three railroads and moved out bag and baggage to a nearby hill to start all over again with a new campus. Three institutions in South Carolina abandoned their old separate ways, joined forces, and will better fulfill a new mission.

What is a simple mission anyway? How does one state it? A good illustration is provided by Hofstra College. Hofstra has adopted ten principles as its mission. I'll just read a few of them. Think how significant these are and ask yourself if your college has anything similar.

One, that Hofstra remain dedicated to the commuting student. Notice that this solves the problem of policy with regard to dormitories, it has implications for the nature of its student activities program, it suggests the nature of the parking problem, it has implications for the admissions office.

Two, that Hofstra continue to be a strong college and resist the siren song of becoming a second rate university. This is a curriculum commitment.

Three, that Hofstra explore ways and means to admit all fully qualified students and not set arbitrary limits upon enrollment. A major policy commitment in terms of size.

Six, that Hofstra continue its policy of a student-centered curriculum, and encouragement of wholesome athletics and co-curricular activities. No comment needed, but this suggests that Hofstra is going to hire professors primarily for their teaching ability rather than for their research attainments.

Seven, that Hofstra continue its dedication to the liberal studies.

Ten, that Hofstra assume increasing responsibility for helping to solve the cultural and economic problems of Suburbia. This is going to be their contribution to their community. This has implication for the evening study program and for the research and service program.

Notice how the basic principles provide answers to many of the other nagging questions which otherwise would have to be faced outside of a context of a basic case.

How many of you have a statement of simple mission which you feel is really useful? I don't mean your catalog statement, I mean a real statement of simple mission? Think it over because the whole development program starts from this base.

Notice how this statement of simple mission and the corrolaries suggest the answers to most of the problems of development and, for that matter, of the whole direction of your college.

First, implications for student body. The statement of case gives you the answers as you try to determine what kind of geographical spread you ought to seek. What sex on campus? I mean are you going to be a women's college, coed, or all male? You ought to know and not just drift into something. Know in terms of your simple mission. What should be the intellectual composition of your student body? Are you really going to be tough or aren't you going to be tough? Are you going to admit to a given enrollment or are you going to admit to a given intellectual standard? What is going to be the religious composition of your campus? You should know, and not just say, "Well, it's about what it is now and that looks pretty good to us." What should be the economic composition of your student body? Are you just going to get people who can pay tuition? Here are the implications for your scholarship and aid programs. What should be the residence proportions? What age? What are the implications for adult services?

How many have an analysis of your student body in this manner? You probably have decided on the size of the student body, but what about these other things? Have you defined, in writing, what kind of a student body will help you accomplish your mission? I think this has to be done.

Second, implications for the faculty? Here's where most of us just fall flat. What are the questions and the implications for the faculty when you examine your simple mission? What are you looking for in a department head? What proportion of emphasis will be given to his research ability versus teaching ability, for instance? What are going to be the criteria for promotion so the faculty man has a base on which he can build? What is going to be the level of competency? Can you afford all Ph.D.s? Would you rather have good instructors with M.A.s rather than a lot of poor Ph.D.s or do you have some other special level of competency objective? What's the spread of skills in your faculty? This goes back to your policy on curriculum. How should it match the student body? It would be a tragedy to aim to be a Parsons College and have a Harvard faculty; it really would. You've got to match the faculty to the aspirations of the educational job. How many have this statement? How many of your officers recruiting new faculty have a statement or agreement on what kind of people you are looking for, or do they just go out and find what they think is the best man for the job and then have trouble with him forever after, because the man himself never did understand what he was supposed to do?

Third, now you've got the statement of simple mission, this gives you some answers for the physical plant. The development man ought to insist that these plant answers be written out, because this is basic to his development program.

The plant decision is dictated by what you've decided about your faculty and your students, not by anything else. The simple mission dictates how many dormitories you will need and what kind of dormitories. Hofstra College will never have any dormitories, because they have made a policy commitment to the commuting student. If a donor offers them one they don't have to re-examine their simple mission, they've got their simple mission. They say, "No Sir, but please give us a student union". The kind of eating facilities will be determined by the simple mission, because these vary according to your long range objectives as to evening students and residence students. What balance of laboratories to classrooms? What balance of research to instruction? Even the parking area development depends a little bit on the kind of decisions you've made earlier.

How many have a plan for the plant? Be careful now, I mean a plant plan keyed into your long range simple mission objectives, not just an architectural sketch of where new buildings would look good if you could get money for them.

Fourth, the statement of simple mission will have implications for the administration. Here's where the development man comes in pretty heavily too. How about your trustees? People too often assume that your trustees come down from heaven and they're immutable, you can't change them. If a college adopts a statement of simple mission it ought to examine its board of trustees just as carefully as it examines its student body. Is the balance of the trustees right for this college? Is the composition right? Do we have mechanism to tear off dead wood and to mobilize the youthful ones? Do trustees represent the proper areas of interest for our simple mission?

Look at the president. Is the president the right man for this simple mission? Maybe the development man himself doesn't fit in the simple mission and might as well get out.

I once knew an Ivy League-oriented development man in a hustling bustling prosperous suburban college who just couldn't bring himself to realize that he was in a suburban commuting service institution and tried persistently to shape it in the image of Harvard or Yale. Consequently he wasn't fitted for the place nor was the college where he should have been. He left, but how much better if he had understood earlier the mission of the college.

Fifth, what are the implications of the simple mission for management and budget. How should you handle endowment? This is part of fund raising -- if you can make $50,000 more by better operation you've just raised $50,000 and you'll make it every year the same way. Should you try to raise money for endowment? (I think we're wasting a lot of time and money trying to raise money for endowment. Can we afford to have money earning 4½ percent when that money can be better spent in the growth of the institution?) Do you have a time-table for future budget growth and a time-table for financial commitments?

What implications do these statements have for the development man? So far your role has been secondary. You haven't been making final decisions but you've been trying to see that they are made. You have been assisting in enunciating the mission and helping to understand the implications for the college.

And of course you have encouraged study of the simple mission and its manifold implications by faculty and students and alumni so that they begin to understand the case for the college itself. This involvement begins to lay another kind of groundwork which you can use then in development of the resources.

Now you as the development officer become more central. You begin building a lot of special cases. This is your basic responsibility -- building cases for your various constituencies.

We're going to talk about this in more detail in later sessions, but I suggest that the main areas in which you will be developing special cases from the major institutional case which derives out of the total case for higher education will be basically in the areas of alumni (some of the alumni), church (the hierarchy of the church and the membership), legislatures (and legislators), corporations and business, special groups and associations (including key individuals), and labor. You'll do this by a careful analysis of leadership of each of these constitutuencies. You'll do this by a careful analysis of the potential so that you won't be spending your time where it will be unproductive. You'll do it by a careful matching of your mission, your simple mission, with their interests -- the interests of these constituency groups and individuals. If the total potential doesn't jibe with the needs of your institution, I'm afraid the institution will have to revise its statement of needs and modify its aspirations. And this has happened sometimes too.

Now what have I been saying?

First, we need a statement of <u>simple mission</u> based on the analysis of the needs of the society in which our institution is an organism. This will not be based on our needs but on the needs of the supporting groups and of the associated groups within which and for which we operate.

Second, we need decisions necessary to <u>implement</u> that mission, and this means decisions as to the nature of students and faculty, the development program itself, plant, management, resources.

Third, we have to interpret the case to specific groups and individuals which the institution serves and which it must look to for support. In a real sense this operation consists of specialized statements of the larger case.

I'm not making this case building an easy job. It's easy in terms of procedures but difficult in terms of implementation.

Many a good development program starts out by helping a college decide what it exists for. If a strong logical case can't be made for your institution, it may not be the corporation or the foundation that's at fault or the individual that's at fault for not giving you money, it may be that your program is not seen as worth supporting.

A sense of purpose is really the greatest asset of the institution. A sense of purpose dictates the basic decisions, keeps committee meetings on the track, unifies the activities of faculty, students, and administration. The simple mission leads you on toward immediate goals and gives you guidance for long range objectives.

Now when you go back to your college after this Institute, please don't go back and say how nice it is, how nice and friendly this little campus is. Go back and look at it with a cold fishy eye and see if there's a case there for support.

THE SPECIFIC ALUMNUS

W. R. BROSSMAN

When I started to sketch out these remarks I put down as a first topic heading the words "Alumni in General." I quickly scratched it out when I realized that there is no such thing. We tend sometimes to forget that alumni are individuals who come in all shapes and sizes: short and tall, enlightened and uninformed, pleasant and mean, wealthy and poor, philanthropic and not, and other characteristics too numerous to mention. These are individuals and, as with individuals in any other part of the spectrum, they have individual feelings, they respond to different things and, alas, they fail to respond to different things.

One thing is sure--there are a lot of them. Millions. The American Alumni Council reports annually on the giving records of some 700 colleges and universities. Those 700 institutions, less than half of our colleges and universities, have a combined alumni constituency alone of almost ten million people. The old Ripley cartoon comes to mind. It was to the effect that if the people of China were to march past a given point four abreast there would never be an end to the parade.

These alumni are all different but they nevertheless exhibit common characteristics. I should like to turn here to a remarkable book by a man named Romeyn Berry. The book is "Behind the Ivy." It happens to be about Cornell, but it is about colleges--and alumni--everywhere. Here are some samples:

> "It is a peculiarity of Cornell graduates that too much among themselves they dwell upon their alma mater's shortcomings; ignore or pass over lightly her many creditable qualities and accomplishments. Outside the family circle, no doubt, they are just as irritating in their expressions of pride and claims of superiority as are the graduates of other institutions which for many years have been spawning alumni misbranded as mature persons possessing poise and understanding."
>
> "The particular shortcoming upon which we dwell varies with the seasons. At one time it's university publicity; at another, the ineptitude of the football team. Just now, it seems to be the curious defect of vision in the office of admissions which leads it to accept Student A while denying Student B, who weighs thirty pounds more and whose father is a very important person."
>
> ***
>
> "Graduates of all American colleges and universities seem to share the delusion that the accomplishments of their own

particular alma mater are insufficiently celebrated in the public prints. This unfortunate state of affairs is commonly ascribed either, or both, to (a) a conspiracy on the part of editors and publishers to suppress all legitimate news of Whoozis U while opening their columns lavishly to the merest tripe about lesser institutions; or to (b) the complete absence of any understanding of the subtle arts of publicity and public relations on the part of anyone connected with their own institution."

***

"The alumni business is predicated on the assumption that the raw material had a happy time in college and retain pleasant memories of their undergraduate days; that by a little steering those memories may be kept a continuing force to the mutual advantage of the alumni and the university. But the trouble is that a certain unknown portion didn't have a good time at all, regard the experience as a grim one, and have no desire to keep alive memories of a hard-won struggle for survival."

To be sure, Berry is having fun. There are alumni who seem to make nothing but trouble. Happily for us their numbers are small; the vast majority are on our side, ready to be challenged by their colleges, increasingly ready to work for admissions and other causes, and steadily more willing to give. Just where would we be without them?

There is a moral in the comment of that unsung alumni worker who suggested we should amend the old phrase "alumni and friends" to read "alumni and <u>other</u> friends."

<u>Alumni Involvement</u>

We come naturally to the subject of alumni offices and alumni secretaries. This is not the place for an examination of those phenomena in any detail. Suffice it to say that most of us have alumni offices and alumni secretaries and that they do a number of useful things.

1. Alumni magazines and newsletters. Most of them continue to be poor advertisements for higher education but we can see signs of improvement. If the Fleur Cowles school of layout can be curbed I think we are headed for higher ground.

2. Homecomings and Reunions. We can take heart in an emerging maturity in these events. We seem to be reaching a better ratio of beer to books, or vice versa. At my own college we are especially intrigued by an unusual kind of reunion--an annual gathering of the alumni for an experimental seminar which we call

"Freedom and Authority." The ideas fly with fire and vigor and the effect is good.

3. Alumni Seminars. We see more and more these forms of what the semanticists like to refer to as continuing education. There is one going on down the hall right now.

4. National alumni association and alumni clubs. There is not much new here except perhaps again a trend toward reflection on what the college is doing in the classroom. The football film is apt to be more the short subject than the main feature.

5. Alumni trusteeships. If I discern any trend here it has alumni trustees acting as full-fledged and responsible trustees of the institution rather than watchdogs of special interests for the alumni.

6. Alumni admissions counselors. Of all the areas of alumni involvement, this seems to be in fullest ferment. The national admissions hysteria has been our ally in making alumni eager to get in and find out what this admissions process is all about. The consequences are useful for alumnus and college alike.

7. Alumni giving. We lead up to this gently. We want our alumni to do more than just give, but above all we want them to give. Again, where would we be without them?

Alumni Giving

What is the rationale of all this alumni giving? Most obvious, of course, is the fact that alumni are the debtors of higher education. Without exception, every alumnus in the United States has enjoyed a subsidy of some sort in going through college. The obvious appeal is to ask him to put it back.

I accompanied one of our trustees on an Annual Fund call on a prosperous alumnus who had never given to the college. The trustee introduced me and then got right to the point: "John," he said, "I think it's about time you started paying for your education."

There are other motives:

A real concern for higher education. This is still a rarity but we can see signs that it is growing.

The competitive instinct. "Let's not let Alabaster show us up in the Alumni Fund this year!"

The desire for an institution of which the alumnus can be more proud. Small colleges particularly benefit from a sort of self-consciousness which tends to be compensated in the alumni gift.

The need to "get that blank-blank solicitor off my back."

Homer Turner of U. S. Steel is sage in observing that "large scale participation by alumni helps guarantee that no single major or monolithic source of support will emerge to dominate the future financing of America's education."

For whatever reason, alumni give. They have given. They are giving. They are giving more and more each year. They will have to give still more. And the surface hasn't really been searched.

The Alumni Fund

At its purest the Fund is an annual pursuit of unrestricted funds for operations. In another guise it seeks funds for specific parts of the educational operation. In some cases it even seeks funds for capital purposes, although this is not regarded as entirely proper, especially when it comes to the competition for the American Alumni Council trophy.

John Pollard gives the credit for the first statement of the Alumni Fund case to a Yale man, Professor William Graham Sumner, who in 1870 had this to say:

> "No graduate of the college has ever paid in full what it cost the college to educate him. A part of the expense was borne by the funds given by former benefactors of the institution. A great many can never pay the debt. A very few can, in their turn, become munificent benefactors. There is a very large number, however, between those two, who can, and would cheerfully, give according to their ability in order that the college might hold the same relative position to future generations which it held to their own. The sense of gratitude, the sense of responsibility, the enlightened interest in the cause of education which, felt by these men, constitute a source which has never been tried, but which would yield richly...
>
> "A popular effort which should seize upon the indebtedness of these men to their institution, and their interest in it, and make it yield money, would be a step in the right direction. If every graduate who could afford it should give the college ten dollars, and others should give more in proportion, we should enter upon a plan whose financial soundness is unquestionable. We should be paying a debt which we all owe. We should be applying principles which are thoroughly in sympathy with the ideas of this popular and democratic age, and we should reach results which we can never attain by waiting for the tardy generosity of a few men of extraordinary wealth."

Sumner did us all a great service. And so today we see the alumni fund--in all its guises--providing a continuing stream of dollars, leading consistent donors to commit themselves to larger gifts, and setting the stage for capital drives.

About the Dollars

The 690 colleges reporting to the American Alumni Council for the year 1959-60 collected $163,000,000 from their alumni. Of this dollar figure, $47,000,000, or more than one fourth, came through alumni annual funds. That is pretty good money. Yet this represents gifts from only 14 percent of the 9,700,000 alumni of these institutions. (The institutions solicited only 6,300,000 of these 9,700,000 alumni, and were rewarded with gifts from only 1,350,000.)

There is a great untapped potential. It is just as clear that very few institutions are doing a good job.

Cy Seymour comments: "Traditionally the alumni fund has been a horizontal form of fund-raising, with little or no selectivity, with a plea rather than a case, and addressed only to alumni. It has been an annual collection rather than a campaign."

The ideal alumni fund, if we follow the book, is one in which great numbers of alumni are involved. This is based on the theory that it takes a giver to make another. There are class organizations, regional organizations to follow up class efforts and, overall, person-to-person fund raising wherever possible.

But beware. Not every college can keep up with the Joneses of alumni fund raising, the Joneses being the Yales and the Dartmouths and the Princetons. Too many are trying to set up fund organizations of volunteers which they are in no position to staff. Too many are trying to move too fast. Even Carleton, with all its record of annual fund success and experience, will concede that it started its regional solicitation before it was ready for it.

Are we spending too much to get too little? I think many of us are. One of the blue-ribbon funds spends about ten percent to get its funds. That sounds high to me.

Are we wasting a lot of effort? It seems to me that it is wasteful of energy, and hard on the spirit, to crank up each fall and do the same old canvass.

We need freshness in this annual fund business and we need some new ideas. We need to incorporate capital fund techniques into the fund. Why can't we do more about annual fund pledges--even monthly installment payments?

Are we going overboard on the incentive matching gift? Wofford started it all in 1955-56 when a friend--he may have been an alumnus too--offered $1000 for each percentage point of gain in fund participation. Wofford worked hard and got up to 74.4 percent participation. That was a great participation. Yet where is Wofford today? I'm afraid the reports show 37 percent participation. Wofford is having trouble coming up with an encore.

An institution that I am familiar with sent out a fund leaflet announcing that for each giver beyond the first 2000, foundation sources would give ten dollars--up to a total of $4000. How do you react to that incentive?

Other New Wrinkles

Colleges here and there have combined efforts to advance their funds. There is no conspicuous report of dollar gain, but the public and alumni attention created is undoubtedly for the good.

Corporate matching plans are still in their infancy. Remember that we talked about $47,000,000 from alumni funds last year. How much of this was eligible for matching? Less than a million and a half. Matching plans are growing in number--some 125 of them today--but they have a long way to go. Undoubtedly they will be with us for a long time.

Picking and Choosing

Most institutions have more alumni than they can properly keep track of. If you can't do a thorough job with them all, concentrate your efforts where they will do the most good. Even if your alumni list bears 10,000 names, you could profitably read the whole list for general familiarization. The alumni office records are the starting point, of course, but too few alumni fund workers have read the college history and read the back numbers of the college magazine for significant names.

In the absence of clear clues to an alumnus's potential as a giver you can ask yourself some questions:

Did he graduate? Normally a four-year student is a more devoted alumnus than a one-year one. Yet in our institution we always keep in mind the exceptions--especially the man who attended only two weeks before he left to make the fortune that he now is sharing generously with us.

Was he a fraternity man, and what about his other activities? The more active the better.

Did he work his way? The student who had to sacrifice to get his education is more apt to sacrifice to help his college.

Does he have alumni brothers, sisters, parents, other relatives? Dynasties breed responsibility.

Does he have an alumni record of fund participation, attendance at club meetings, reunions and such?

Is he a church member or an active participant in community affairs? Both are often good signs.

What college vintage is he? Some college generations or classes are more spirited than others.

What does he do for a living?

And so on.

If you must be selective in your alumni fund efforts--and I think we all have to be to a degree--bite off a small piece at the start. Every college has a lively class or two with a good class leader. Here is the place to try for heavy percentage of participation, to experiment with person-to-person solicitation, to perfect other techniques. In other words, look for a bell cow.

When you are ready for wider terrain you still don't have to make it an extravagant performance. A simple leaflet or letter can be just as effective as an elaborate brochure or fancy foldouts. The facts, I am glad to note, are replacing those cute mailers that talk about money trees. Cuteness palls in a hurry.

At Colorado College we like to keep our costs down in small ways too. Our alumni file folders are old ones that the Colorado Interstate Gas Company was about to throw out.

Random Notes

Don't forget the local alumni. They are always the hardest to deal with because they live next door and they know all about it. But remember that they are close at hand and it doesn't take expensive travel or a long-distance telephone to reach them.

How about the long-dormant alumnus? There is something about an admissions assignment that will do wonders.

Let me close by citing Dr. Paul Giddens, president of Hamline University. Dr. Giddens tried to teach me history once at 8 o'clock in the morning. He has gone on to more profitable things and his Hamline Alumni Fund has jumped to 40 percent participation in just three years of existence. Here are his eight points of a president's responsibility toward an effective alumni program:

1. Accepting this as a direct administrative concern deserving of the full weight and influence of his position.

2. Giving general direction and emphasis to the objectives of the program.

3. Involving the top alumni in positions of leadership.

4. Keeping the alumni informed through good publications.

5. Insuring a capable director and giving him the equipment and the staff needed for doing a significant job.

6. Speaking to alumni clubs throughout the country.

7. Acknowledging personally all gifts from alumni in one way or another.

8. Preparing complete reports that accurately reflect alumni support of the college.

COMPANY GIVING

ARTHUR J. SCHAEFER

Corporate giving to higher education has reached such a point that the question for companies is no longer whether to give to colleges and universities but how to give...and how much...and to whom.

As one corporation officer is quoted in a survey of Chicagoland company giving, "We find it a much easier job to earn money in our company than to give it away intelligently."

The increase in corporate contributions in recent years is reflected in a comparison of biennial surveys sponsored by the Council for Financial Aid to Education. In 1956, 275 companies taking part in the survey gave $28.5 million to higher education; in 1958, 379 leading companies gave $52.5 million -- an increase of 37% in the number of participating companies and of 84% in the dollar amount. According to CFAE's Dr. John A. Pollard, of the estimated $550 million in company giving to all causes in 1958, higher education's share was approximately $136.5 million -- or 26% of the total. In 1950, he notes, it was less than 17%.

The Council estimates that by 1969-70, the investment in higher education in the United States will have to be at least $9 billion a year for all purposes -- roughly twice the figure for 1958-9. Of this amount, CFAE figures that approximately $500 million will come from business and industry. The prospect of 800,000 American business firms contributing at least $500 million to higher education is, as Dr. Pollard puts it, a "stirring picture," but it does not seem out of line when viewed in the light of growth in corporate support in recent years.

Some of the problems companies will have in distributing these funds and the difficulties we as development officers can anticipate in earning them for our colleges are detailed in a study, Company Giving, published in 1960 under the sponsorship of the Chicago Chapter of the Public Relations Society of America.

The study, undertaken by the firm of Leo J. Shapiro and Associates, surveyed all companies in the five-county metropolitan area of Chicago, dividing them into six groups according to number of employees, ranging from four to upwards of 1,000. A minimum of 70% of the companies in each group were contacted, each contact requiring from three to fifteen separate personal interviews. It is a report, says former Sears Roebuck vice president James C. Worthy in a preface to the publication, that has never been equalled in depth and scope.

I should like to give you some of the high spots of the Shapiro study for the guides they offer to a development officer in intelligently seeking out financial support from business and industry.

First, the survey discloses that -- at least up to the year of the study, 1956 -- corporate giving does not proceed from well-articulated company policies. Only about 10% of the companies examined had written statements governing their giving; where these statements existed, they generally were developed after the fact, as a summation of company practices. Only sectarian religious groups were eliminated with any frequency, 24% of the larger companies reporting this restriction.

Development of giving policies is recognized as a problem more for large, publicly-owned corporations than for closely held corporations. "The search for rationality" was under way in 1956; it would be our observation that firms today are unceasingly engaged in quest for a reasonable method of giving.

In his preface to the study, Mr. Worthy notes some dangers to this trend toward policy formation. One is the increasing caution it will develop among contributions committees in an area of activity that often calls for a venturesome spirit. Another is the logic of corporate support of religious institutions. Most companies have steered clear, yet "ours is basically a religious society," Mr. Worthy points out. "In all likelihood," he adds, "management's fear on this score is exaggerated, and client publics may well be ready to accept corporate activity in the religious field with equanimity and approval."

Coincident with this trend toward decisions based upon policy is the trend toward making contributions a company activity, a regular part of the business, with delegation of responsibility away from the chief executive officer to contributions committees and departments with contributions managers. While the chief officer administered the giving program in 71% of the smaller companies, this was the case in only 7% of the largest companies.

An increase in company foundations parallels the "search for rationality." Of the companies with 1,000 or more employees, 39% have established company-sponsored foundations or trusts. Through these foundations the companies can maintain present giving rates for two to three years, on the average, without further support; in some cases, for as long as eight to ten years. Some companies distinguish between the types of causes supported directly by the corporation and those supported through the foundation. Often, the former involve one-year commitments, whereas the latter are for longer periods. Again, the company through its branches may support local causes directly, whereas its foundation undertakes programs more national in scope.

Up to the time of the Shapiro survey, Chicagoland companies had not yet devised a suitable formula to answer the question, "How much to give?" The "no-method method" was by far the most common one in use in all categories. The next most common practice was that of basing current contributions on the amount of previous contributions; larger firms were more apt to use this than smaller ones. The implications for the development director in maintaining liaisons and following up on donors are fairly obvious.

It should not be interpreted from this lack of method that companies are indifferent to the nature of the causes they support. On the contrary, they want to know specifically what cause they are furthering and how their money will be used. Nearly every one of the largest companies answering questions, the Chicago report points out, spoke of the importance of knowing precisely the purpose or function of the organization and the intended use of the funds.

It will be surprising to most of us to learn from the Shapiro study that one-third of Chicagoland's largest companies gave more than 50% of their contributions to a single organization. This tendency to give a larger share to one organization increases in frequency as the company decreases in size. Only about one-tenth of the largest companies gave less than 10% of their contribution budget to any one organization.

The largest companies reported, 72% strong, that the Community Fund was their greatest beneficiary, with Red Cross, hospital, and educational organizations each leading in about 6% of the remainder. The preference for the Community Fund diminished as the company size decreased, with only 38% of the smallest companies placing it first. The organizations benefiting most from this change of emphasis among the smaller companies were the religious organizations.

The fear of "opening the door" to similar requests from other groups prevents a sizable number of companies from responding to appeals for funds. From 41% to 48% of companies in the various size categories admitted putting off contributions that would prompt others to apply.

Pressure is a real factor for many companies. Among the largest firms, 36% said this happens frequently, 42% occasionally. Only in the smallest category (four to nineteen employees) nearly 10% said they never receive such pressure. A gradual increase in submission to pressure was noted as the company decreased in size.

The chief executive of a large Chicago-based company is quoted in the study: "Among the thousands or more written and verbal requests received, it is likely that the more aggressive and forceful solicitations may get more than their rightful share."

How much do companies give in relation to net income before taxes? The survey shows that larger companies give more generously than smaller ones. The tabulation is as follows:

	Size of Company					
	1000 or more empls.	500-999	250-499	100-249	20-99	4-19
Per cent that Contributed	97	92	93	97	93	85
Total Contributions (Median) (Chgo-hdqtr. companies)	$34,117	$9,999	$2,625	$3,208	$875	$379
Per cent of Pre-Tax Profit	.99	1.61	.60	.78	.32	.09

What kind of companies give most? No sharp differences were discerned in the major industries. Manufacturers held a small edge over other businesses in the two highest giving groups, and the service trades appeared most frequently in the lowest giving category. The areas of finance and communications were exceptions, with companies in both fields clearly ranking among the top givers.

What do companies give for? The survey showed that large companies support a variety of causes, contributing more frequently to education, youth, recreation, and business and civic groups. The smaller companies more frequently contribute to religious causes and health causes, which have stronger personal appeals. (It may be interesting to interpolate here that on the national level, the 1958 CFAE survey revealed that the three top purposes for company giving to higher education were as follows: 34.1% unrestricted; 16.9% buildings and equipment; and 15% student aid.)

While I can recall no reference in the Shapiro study to a shifting of company giving in the direction of higher education, the consensus among my associates in other Chicagoland fund-raising fields seems to be that our cause is gaining in strength, sometimes at the expense of other causes. We would do well to keep in mind, however, the increasing demands made upon corporations for their giving dollars.

"Probably no single phenomenon," says Dr. Shapiro, "of American life has been more noteworthy in recent years than the remarkable growth in the number and variety of 'causes' soliciting business and industry for money, time, or other forms of support. Literally hundreds--sometimes thousands--of requests are received annually by the average company."

Movements related to corporate giving should be noted in this perspective of company support. One is the associated college movement, which has grown to the point that some forty state and regional associations now blanket the country. The principal object of these groups has been to obtain corporate funds for current

support of some 500 private colleges. The movement has raised $50 million since its inception and nearly $10 million in 1960, but in the eyes of at least one qualified person, H. Clyde Reeves, president of the Kentucky Independent Colleges Foundation, it has not become as great a source of support as many had hoped. Only 7% of corporate giving to higher education, he notes, is through state and regional college associations.

The other movement now afoot is the so-called Cleveland Compact, in which a group of twenty-one corporate heads in Cleveland have agreed to "corporate contributions commencing at once and increasing within three years to a minimum of one percent of income before taxes, and thereafter gradually as the need develops."

As a story on the Cleveland Compact in Reader's Digest last February points out, "should corporations generally follow Cleveland's lead, more than a half billion badly needed dollars would flow annually into our colleges and universities."

College development officers in other cities are now probing with friendly corporate officers the possibilities of introducing the Cleveland plan or some variation of it into their own communities. They are receiving valued assistance from Dr. Frank Sparks and Francis Pray of the Council for Financial Aid to Education.

The effect of widespread adoption of this plan will be more corporate dollars for your institutions in the years ahead. How much you actually get will depend upon the soundness and resourcefulness of your approach.

GOING FOR THE BIG ONES - THE SPECIAL GIFT

ARTHUR J. SCHAEFER

Last summer at another institute for development officers, Fran Pray and other members of the Institute faculty heard me make a sweeping statement while talking about the Alumni Fund. It was to the effect that there is no one -- absolutely no one -- from whom you cannot get a sizable gift-- if you set your mind to it. Fran remembers a classic story about a big prospect--and he has to be shown.

The story, which I am told has Dartmouth origins, is about a group of grads calling on a classmate who had never given to his alma mater. "Joe," they told him, "we know you are a man of considerable means, your income last year was $325,000, you have heavy real estate holdings, you own oil in Texas, hotels in Florida, rubber in Sumatra, securities on Wall Street. Our special report indicates you are worth between $15,000,000 and $20,000,000.

"You know all about our 25-Year Class Fund, Joe. We'd like you to make a substantial contribution."

Fran remembers that Joe looked thoughtfully at his classmates before he replied: "You fellows have done a pretty thorough research job on me, but you've missed a few things. My income last year wasn't $325,000--it was closer to $600,000. You overlooked a dozen or so interests I have in South America and Africa. My net worth, I am pleased to tell you, is not $20,000,000 but in excess of $25,000,000. However, there are other factors you don't know anything about. My mother has been crippled for many years and has been in and out of hospitals and nursing homes at tremendous expense. A brother of mine has been afflicted for several years with a rare disease that specialists around the world haven't been able to cure. My own daughter has had an unfortunate marriage and is left with seven youngsters to care for. So I ask you gentlemen, if I haven't done anything for all these relatives, why should I do anything for you?"

To show that big gifts are possible even from guys like Joe, I asked twenty-five colleagues representing a variety of institutions across the country -- colleagues whom I consider to be among our top development officers -- to give me case histories that highlight various aspects of going after the big ones. Twenty-four were kind enough to reply.

This, then, is their story as much as it is mine. It is a fascinating story about a rewarding human experience -- a story about dreams for advancing the human intellect and strengthening the nation's intellectual resources -- and finding people as stimulated as you are by these dreams to help make them realities.

This present viewpoint is refreshing to a fellow who felt himself pushed fifteen years ago from a college teaching career into public relations and, even more reluctantly, into fund raising. I venture that most of you have harbored some misgivings about "begging for money." Some of you have already succumbed, I am sure, to the thrill of the chase and find big-game hunting an exhilarating experience. Together, during this meeting, we may prompt the rest of you, the stay-at-homes, to share with us the view of Dr. Millicent McIntosh that "accepted in its larger framework, the task becomes exciting and any success truly satisfying."

Let's face it: If you want big gifts, you must go after them with all the ardor and preparation of a hunter on a safari. And your president must be a member of the expedition. The top donor enjoys the prestige of talking with the institution's top man. As a wealthy Chicago businessman told a member of our development staff recently: "You're a nice young man, but I run a big corporation and I'm used to playing with first stringers. Where's your president?"

While every gift is "special" in the donor's mind -- and therefore deserves adequate acknowledgement -- when we talk about special gifts we have reference to those that run upward from $1,000. (At Princeton, the figure is $100,000 -- so you can see how relative this thing gets.) Special gifts are the core of fund raising; they account for from 70% to 90% of the totals raised in any successful campaign.

Let us consider the six basic steps that deserve development and refinement if there is to be a continuing flow of big gifts to any institution.

Step 1: Have something to sell. If the shelves are bare, there is nothing the customer can buy. The best way to stock up is to have attractively packaged institutional goals, with long-range implementations in terms of programs, manpower, plant, and finances. I know of one institution that is now scrambling because an old friend recently indicated he is ready to make a six- or seven-figure commitment if it can come up with something he will be interested in. Long-range blueprints that make sense are not drawn up overnight; they should be on display when the development store doors are opened.

Perhaps last year's Ford Foundation grants of $46 million to five universities will stimulate long-range planning "commensurate," as Dr. Heald phrased it, "in scope, imagination, and practicality to the vast needs of American society." You may have noted in the Ford Foundation release that the president of each institution under consideration was asked, "What kind of a university do you hope to see in the year 2000?" Each was asked to outline educational objectives, plans, and priorities and to identify his "target for funds" during the next decade.

Aside from being good management, long-range planning is good salesmanship. A prospective donor is inspired by the total dream and the part his contribution will play in making it real. The inspiring words of the great Chicago architect, Daniel Burnham, come to mind from a half-century ago: "Make no little plans; they have no magic to stir men's blood." Big plans have often stirred men to invest more than they originally planned. Such was the experience of one midwestern university whose blueprints for technology lifted a donor's modest initial gift to an ultimate $37,000,000.

Step 2: Find your prospects. This can be done in many ways, but it should be done as systematically as the Ph.D candidate probes for umlauts in 15th century incunabula. There are obvious ways of finding prospects -- buying lists of wealthy persons, scanning the financial and society pages of local newspapers, accumulating important club rosters, gathering programs that list patrons of benefits and cultural activities. Certainly all of these are potential donors -- in the sense that they have money to give. But they are everybody's prey. Far more susceptible to your story are the folks closer to home -- trustees, alumni, parents of students, friends. They already have an interest in your institution. Certainly, they are the first prospects for the big gift.

It came as a surprise to me to learn last year at one of the conferences for college presidents sponsored by the Council for Financial Aid to Education that some well-established colleges still lack alumni files with accurate mailing lists. One president reported that when he came to his institution two years earlier, a makeshift alumni organization existed but the alumni officers didn't know each other.

Alumni are not only special gift prospects; they lead the way effectively to other prospective donors. One midwestern university, discovering that an alumnus was vice president of a large corporation with headquarters in New York City, prevailed upon him to 1) obtain a substantial capital gift from the corporation, 2) lead a campaign among New York alumni that raised $30,000 against a $15,000 local goal, 3) accept the chairmanship of a permanent corporate-appeals committee in New York City, and 4) join the university's board of governors.

You learn the present whereabouts of your alumni as best you can--but you find them--by examining the newspaper and magazine stories supplied by your clipping service, by looking for your graduates among the list of corporate officers in Poor's and other directories, by keeping your ears open for gossip that friends and acquaintances spontaneously pass along when they know you are after the big ones.

Parents of students are often ignored as prospects for the special gift. One development director spoke to the entire student body of his university in class sections, asking them to suggest

persons capable of supporting the school campaign. At last report, he had a $500,000 contribution in the hopper because of a lead furnished on the prospective donor by his own son. "Strange as it may seem," he comments, "a great many students submitted their parents as prospects."

Prospects turn up in other ways. A vice president for development has added to his file the names of 2,000 persons known to have willed their bodies after death to the university's school of medicine. Another discovered a prospect while bowling week after week in a club league with his son; the prospect later made an unrestricted gift of a half million dollars to the university. I know of two large gifts that were cultivated neighbor to neighbor over lawn mowers.

The unknowns, the "sleepers," are preferred prospects because they are more likely to be impressed by your efforts to cultivate them. I am not actively hostile to domestic animals but it grieves me to read, every now and then, about the spinster who leaves an estate of $1,000,000 that literally goes to the dogs. Another evidence that educational research is sometimes not all that it should be!

The vice president of a western college describes an unlikely and unapproachable prospect, a citrus man "in faded worn-out overalls, wearing a ragged old straw hat, peering out through the holes with a hostile look on first meeting," who was cultivated to the extent of leaving his entire estate in excess of $500,000 to his college.

The story is told of the farmer in overalls who drove his rattling model-T onto the campus of a north central college, intent upon learning how he could make a gift of a building to the institution. Because of his appearance, the president's secretary refused to let him in to see her boss. On his way home, the farmer dropped in on impulse at another college and was graciously received. An art building in his name now reminds one campus of his generosity and another of its missed opportunity.

Special lookout should be kept for persons of means with no dependents -- or with dependents for whom trust funds have already been set up. One such gentlemen, an oil man who regularly retreated northward from Texas dust storms, was discovered by a midwestern medico after he had the fortune -- good or bad, depending on your viewpoint -- to be hit by an automobile and hospitalized. The medico informed his university president, arranged for him to tell his story, and prescribed a northern convalescence long enough to produce an outright gift of $800,000, with prospects for more to come.

Your own woods are so full of game that it seems wasteful of effort to tread beaten trails to the great foundations and the nation's best known philanthropists. It's more productive to find your own private prospects -- and keep them under lock and key.

Step 3: Build up each prospect file. A name on a card is not worth much until we have learned a great deal about the person it represents -- background, special interests, philanthropic record, current means. Many institutions organize the help of trustees, associates, and alumni to fill in such information and rate the prospect's capacity to give.

Too often we think of our alumni in the aggregate, not as individuals, and satisfy ourselves with group approaches to them. One institution studies every contributor to learn what it can about him. Research on one $5 donor led after eight months of followup to a gift of $20,000.

A midwestern university felt it had the right prospect for the new library building it needed but nothing to attract him -- until it dug up the information that his wife had gathered a collection of scientific books and papers and was concerned about their permanent housing. This knowledge led to an alteration in plans that provided for the collection to be housed in a penthouse atop the library building -- and $3,500,000 for building and penthouse from the prospect.

An urban institution has received grants and pledges in excess of $22,000,000 because a president rightly sized up a self-made man as one who was willing to help others acquire an education while living at home. This institution also obtained $25,000 from a relatively small local foundation when its file revealed that the foundation was nearing a giving deadline.

If you can walk into your office and pull out the file of a prospect that contains all the pertinent correspondence, clippings that reflect business, professional, social and personal activities, notes from various sources with relevant information, estimates of financial worth and capacity to give, your search for special gifts has reached a stage of refinement that will soon produce results. Provided, of course, that you carry on through these remaining stages.

Step 4: Cultivate interest. If there is one refrain from the stories of twenty-four colleagues, it is that persistence coupled with patience are the keys to the big gift. People generally seem unaware of the time involved in the cultivation, planting, and nurturing that precedes harvesting of the big gift. After all, it isn't radishes we are looking for!

Cultivation requires continuous, effective communication between the institution and the prospect. It requires increasing involvement in the life of the institution. It requires creative

appeal to the special interests of the prospect. And, though an occasional donor prefers anonymity, it requires recognition -- again in an imaginative way.

Institutional events -- ceremonies, lectures, convocations, dinner parties, athletic activities -- should be examined for their potential in drawing special prospects closer to the institution. Pre-football luncheons and after-game receptions in the president's home -- commencement luncheons at which a select group welcomes the graduation speaker and the honorary degree recipients...these are just a few of the opportunities that enable a president to favor special guests with his personal invitation.

Flowers figure in the cultivation program of one university whose annual floral bill runs to several thousand dollars, representing the president's remembrances at Christmas and Easter and during times of hospitalization. There are also orchids for selected widows on their birthdays. Our own institution sends birthday greetings from the president to all our alumni and friends.

Cultivation takes time and sometimes meets with adversity. Those who drop a prospect after the first refusal should realize that many big gifts are made after several turn-downs. The development officer of a southern school tells of a prospect who repeatedly refused to consider a proposal involving $250,000. On the thirteenth call, he not only made the requested gift but actually provided funds for a building and since its erection has paid for landscaping, furnishings, and works of art, and has devoted hours of his time to the school.

Another institution had two disappointing experiences within three months of each other when a pair of donors, whose annual contributions had been for sums ranging up to $5,000, separately indicated that they were not of a mood to continue their giving. They said, in effect: "Please let us alone."

Instead of taking them at their word, this college summoned all its resourcefulness to keep these men informed of the college's activities and interested in its welfare. Four years later, it received an outright gift of $250,000 from one of the donors, and less than two years after that, a gift of $1-1/2 million from the other.

The gift of personal services I mentioned earlier is the ultimate in the cultivation process. One midwestern university tried unsuccessfully in 1956 to get a prominent business man on its board. Two years later the president outlined a ten-year development program and asked him to serve as one of its leaders. He accepted and, in addition to making a six-figure pledge, has given the university two days of his time each week for the past two years. A civic social leader now has a desk and private phone at the university and spends practically his full time there.

If you still have doubts that a gift can be obtained from anyone, consider the many stories about large benefactions that outgrew strong antagonisms between the ultimate benefactor and the institution. A classic example is that of the prominent business man who withdrew his niece from a midwestern university with the widely publicized accusation that it was a hotbed of communism. So ably did the president mend fences that in 1937 the business man announced a gift of $550,000 to establish at that university a foundation in his name to study American institutions. Contributions from this family are still being made to the same university.

Step 5: Invite the investment. Few gifts come spontaneously; most must be asked for. The timing of the proposal is important -- particularly when the suggested investment is a large one. The prospect must have been cultivated adequately to make this something he wants to do -- and his personal or corporate financial affairs must be in a state that makes it possible for him to do it. It is not safe to assume that his financial and legal advisers are fully informed about the tax aspects of giving; counsel specializing in this work should be available to his advisers to point out how the investment can be made to best advantage.

There is danger of haste in inviting the investment; there is also danger of postponing it until too late. One institution almost missed out on important gifts because the prospect lived in an out-of-the-way Texas cattle town. When the presentation was finally made, the prospect was on the verge of giving his money to another college. An on-the-spot contribution of $50,000 was later increased to $300,000.

Who invites the investment is an important consideration in going after the big gift. Usually, this will be the person or group that has led the cultivation process. Sometimes, however, you encounter surprises, as we did recently when our president casually remarked at a golf outing to the head of a corporate foundation that he would like to talk sometime about increasing its annual gift from $1,000 to $5,000. "Fine, Father," the man replied. "But I'll tell you this: you'll never get more than $1,000 from us if you keep letting So-and-so ask for it." So-and-so, one of our lay trustees, was the initial source of the gift and, as far as we were concerned, the best possible person to continue making the annual call.

The presentation seeking the investment deserves to be appropriate to the size and nature of the gift being asked. It should be crisp, accurate, thorough but compact; it should stir the imagination and arouse the special interest of the prospect. Sometimes, it is worthwhile to dress up the presentation, as did the institution which presented its proposal for the $3-1/2 million library in a 16 x 24 inch book with handset type on heavy vellum paper, handsomely bound in genuine leather -- at a cost of several hundred dollars.

Step 6: Follow through! "If the big gift has come in," says one of our development colleagues, "we cash the check, establish the professorship, or affix the plaque -- and then forget it. If it has not yet come in, in our day-to-day rush of counting paper clips and putting out small fires, we keep off having lunch with the prospect or arranging for the president to lunch with him, neglect to send him a personal invitation to a noteworthy lecture, neglect to send him a congratulatory note when he gets promoted, fail to send him a Christmas card -- or the hundred and one things we know should be done."

Effective handling of gift publicity, letters of appreciation to all persons involved in its acquisition, remembrance of these persons on invitation lists -- these are some of the means that prompt continued and larger giving from past donors. It is axiomatic in fund raising that your past donors are your best prospects. The secretary of one foundation told me after it had given us $75,000 -- and had been deluged with approving letters from our Board members -- that the foundation's trustees wished they had given us more. "All we ever get from _____," he said, naming a New England school, "is a receipt."

Never despair! Remember that you can get a gift from anyone -- if you don't give up. With this latest refusal, you have simply scouted the field and laid the groundwork for your next assault.

And never presume! Some of you can tell your own stories of the big ones that got away -- even when they seemed in the net, alongside the boat. Remember that the hospital usually gets them last -- and hospitals also need money. One university had to rally its trustees to rescue a benefactor from writing a codicil that would have transferred a million dollars from the university to the hospital which was treating him so well in his declining days.

Shakespeare has a word for us concerning the big gift, this from Act V of Hamlet:

> "If it be now, 'tis not to come;
> If it be not to come, it will be now;
> If it be not now, yet it will come:
> The readiness is all."

THE COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY RELATIONS IN THE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

W. NOEL JOHNSTON

Everyone is an expert in public relations. Nobody looks over the shoulder of the taxidermist, the lion tamer or the bricklayer to suggest how the job should be done but everyone is certain that he knows how to do the job of the public relations man.

In the speech given by Francis Pray of the Council for Financial Aid to Education at the 1961 Annual Conference of ACPRA* explodes many of the myths in public relations -- myths that needed exploding. His talk reinforces my own notions that all too often we grind out a publicity program without regard to its effect and with very little regard for its sense of purpose.

Why have a program in PR at all? The early institutions of higher learning had no officer serving in this capacity. The president of the college taught Greek and the sciences, kept the books, hired and fired the faculty, admitted students, awarded scholarships, watched over the morals of the students, preached two sermons each Sunday, led a daily chapel devotion and -- on cold days -- stoked the furnace. He also handled the public relations. He was, after all, dealing with a rather limited constituency closely identified with the college and related through personal contact to the problems, the needs and the purposes of the college.

Support for the college came from a relatively small group of men who knew -- in precise terms -- what it was they were supporting. They also knew precisely <u>who</u> they were supporting.

For this reason they were willing to forgive even the addle headed scientist who preached that men were descended from apes. In my own institution, Ohio Wesleyan University, two professors testified at the Scopes trial -- when evolution was a most controversial issue. I have not found any evidence that the college lost any supporters as a result of the action of these two men. The supporters of the college knew these men personally, they respected them as scholars and they trusted them.

Teachers were recruited on the basis of personal friendships and recommendations -- and students were attracted in the same way. What printed material that existed was refreshing in its bluntness -- a far cry from the bland pap that most of us allow to ooze from our publication pores today. It was not unusual for a promotion piece to say something like this: "We select our students

---

*<u>The Great Public Relations Mythology Trap -- And a Way Out</u>, by Francis C. Pray, Vice President for College Relations, The Council for Financial Aid to Education. Reprinted in <u>Selected Papers from the Denver Conference</u>, ACPRA, Washington, 1962.

for high moral attributes. We maintain right discipline and practice religious indoctrination to preserve that level of mortality." One Kentucky college boasted that there was no vendor of spiritous liquors operating within thirty miles.

All of this is to illustrate that early public relations was unself-conscious and highly personal, highly localized in terms of geography as well as constituency -- and any lies that were told were told deliberately and with a purpose. I suppose that we would call our forefathers naive, but they worked in a natural environment we must strive to create. We have built complex institutions resulting complexity in the identification of constituencies dissemination of information to them.

lessing of the broadening base of support for institu- learning has brought with it the curse of blurring our es The latitude and diversity which such support has brough made our mission difficult and has made uniqueness virtually impossible. We must contrive ways to do the personal things which came naturally in the once simple environment.

My major premise, then, is that news releases, letters and publications merely substitute for personal contact -- and a pretty poor substitute they are. The relationship of an institution to its constituencies results from what it is and does, not from what it says. If you are presenting a carefully packaged image and your faculty, staff and students are telling their friends that "it just ain't so" -- you are in trouble.

Public relations starts at home. Get on the faculty team -- don't try to make them join your team. Strive for the faculty viewpoint and do it by having sympathy for the educational process and for education. If you would just as soon be using the same public relations techniques to sell soap - -if you don't have a deep commitment to and belief in higher education -- you will do much better selling soap.

Work on your relationship with your president. Respect his prerogatives. Work in the open -- don't contact the trustees without clearing with him. The president expects to announce events of major importance and the press is used to his making those announcements. So make them in his name.

And most importantly, don't take yourself too seriously.

A good public relations program is built on a good news bureau and a good news bureau is judged by the quality -- not just the quantity of its news stories. A news bureau with an understanding of the image of the institution and with the courage and/or security to pass up the easy story for the one that contributes to the desired image is a good news bureau. The more difficult stories are the ones that accurately interpret the faculty, the students and

the mission of the institution to the public. If the image cast is accurate and not misleading, it can reduce such problems as a turnover of students caused by a general misunderstanding of the nature of the institution.

Publications must be tailored to the institution. They may be as simple as the Antioch Notes, as expensive as a finishing school recruiting brochure, but every publication should be prepared carefully regardless of cost or scope. Viewbooks, development brochures, artist series promotions, the freshman handbook, the faculty handbook, the alumni magazine, the faculty newsletter, the associates letter and all other communication devices must be meticulously planned and objectively evaluated. Small errors make important differences in the impact of the piece. As James Thurber pointed out "Lafayette we are here" when carelessly handled becomes "Lafayette we ate here."

Good special events and series programs offer many opportunities for involving constituencies in the life of the institution. Open houses, parents days, local community days, speakers bureaus, art or cultural series, and political days are all natural events to which special groups can be invited. Once interest is aroused through such involvements, more significant attachments can be developed. One word of caution -- if you ask volunteers for advice, be prepared to take it. Nothing is so humiliating to the volunteer as to be asked for his opinion when there is obviously no one actually listening to his advice.

Any or all of the above suggestions can be important in college public relations, but they are not ends in themselves. They must not be instituted simply because someone else has them. For example, at one major state institution, the alumni magazine is so independent that it can be -- and is -- in active opposition to the administration of the university. Although this program seems to work well enough at this state university, it is not a concept to be thoughtlessly adopted everywhere.

We must be tough in looking at techniques or devices to check their appropriateness and their effectiveness. Is it worth it in time, in dollars and its effect on the program? Personally, I am convinced in the benefits of going against the prevailing tide. The best reason not to do a given thing may be that everyone else is doing it. I hate to hear flat statements that this or that way is the way. We recently mailed a letter to our development associates group that was not well written. We sent it because it was not well written and because we knew that everyone who read the letter would be certain that the man who signed it actually did write it. We reasoned that it would be a wholesome change of pace from the carefully distilled, refined and perhaps dehydrated letters we have been sending.

The why question must be asked of everything we do at the institution -- but nowhere is it more important than in our public relations program. Is any soul so dead that he hasn't ground his

teeth at the Madison Avenue concept of the average American home -- and of what the people who inhabit that home are like? Yet we are all guilty of the same kind of thinking. "Personally," we say, "I never read the kind of tripe that we publish in our alumni magazine -- but that is what the average alumnus likes." If a printed piece seems dull to you, it will probably seem dull to others. Geniuses that we are, it is time that we admit that our taste is likely to parallel rather closely the taste of those with whom we are identified. It it doesn't, we should think of identifying with another group.

How is PR coordinated with development? Actually, they are intertwined so closely that it is impossible to separate them. The objectives of a public relations program as I see them are: 1) to catch the spirit of the mission of the institution and to increase public awareness and understanding of that mission; 2) to win understanding and support for the institution by interpretation of its services as well as its needs; 3) to develop and to improve communication between the institution and its constituencies -- in both directions; 4) to improve communication within the institution.

Public opinion is made up of countless impressions which somehow translate themselves into a thing we call reputation. Reputation is a complex of things, hard to build and hard to change. But somehow -- I am convinced -- reputation is based, in the long run, on performance. Our public relations program can be no better than our institution, but a public relations program can help accent the institution's strengths.

Where does PR fit in on the organization chart? This has been the ground for a raging battle in some institutions. If public relations is to be tied to fund raising, is it not tainted or at least slanted? If we accept the ideal of an institution geared to an overall and on-going effort of academic growth, it is ridiculous to assume that the public relations program can be divorced or separated from the other elements of a development effort. I stand with those who maintain that a true development program is a public relations program.

Who should be boss? I care nothing for charts of organization. I know, and you know, that people make or break organizations and the charts that describe them. If I were setting up from scratch I would have all public relations activities under the direction of the development officer. In any case, with any chart, the public relations program must be responsive to the aims and functions of the development program.

How much money should be spent on PR? This difficult question can be answered only in the perspective of your own needs and desires. For years we have talked about "friend raising" followed by "fund raising". Lately, we have begun to wonder whether mere dissemination of information raises friends -- and, even more significantly -- we have begun to wonder if a friend is necessarily

a donor. Nevertheless, if your natural supporters are existing in a dark pool of ignorance of your activity, you will do well to allocate a large portion of your budget to informing them of what you are doing.

The need for support in the future is closely documented. However, the people who must supply that support are being deluged with information and appeals -- many of them from organizations and institutions fully as worthy as yours. The organizations and institutions which will survive and prosper will be those which manage to get people to <u>care</u>. Gimmicks won't do it. An earnest and honest effort to bring the story of your college to potential friends is the only way.

The new manager of a down-at-the-heels hotel made his first improvement by taking down the "home sweet home" sign and replacing it with a sign that read "adjust."

Human nature hasn't changed but the store of information available to humans has changed. We must adjust to new ideas, new techniques to insure that the future of our institution is directed by intelligent, informed decisions and not by indifference or ignorance.

TRUSTEES AND GOVERNING BOARDS AND YOUR DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM - SOME CONSIDERATIONS

FRANCIS C. PRAY

We have spoken much in the Institute about the necessity to identify and mobilize leaders in our society on behalf of our colleges and universities. We have talked about identifying elements of the power structure, the necessity for interesting special donors, and mobilizing opinion leaders.

Many of these individuals are already heavily committed to the welfare of our colleges and universities in their official capacities as trustees. The tragedy is that many others, also serving as trustees, who should bring interest and energy to their trustee relationships, are so uncommitted. In the trustee group lies one of our great opportunities, just as among the trustees lie many of our serious problems.

It has been estimated that there are between twenty and thirty thousand men and women in America who almost literally own and in a legal sense almost absolutely control the welfare of our institutions of higher education.

These are our board members - our trustees.

This group of men and women is of such underlying importance in our development programs that we will neglect them at our peril, we will take them for granted at our risk.

Why are trustees so significant? Because, as Paul H. Davis found in a special study completed by him for Reader's Digest, "Exceptional institutions have, or have had, an outstanding board of trustees." Because, as President Douglas M. Knight of Lawrence College said, "You might well look at the board of trustees; for I suspect that you will find that at great colleges the boards of trustees do much more than select the president, play with the endowment, and build buildings; the boards there will be taking an active interest in all phases of the college, yet aiding rather than interfering with the administration and the faculty."

Why should the development officer be concerned with the trustees - aren't the trustees primarily the concern of the president?

I believe that more than any other administrative officer, the development director shares with the president concern for having an effective, working, board of trustees. I merely remind you that the ideal trustee is a donor, a procurer of financial support from others, an ambassador and sponsor of the institution, and a signi-

ficant resource in counsel, guidance, and advice, to underline his importance in the growth of the institution.

The effective board of trustees will be concerned with development as one of its major preoccupations. It will consider the comprehensive development plan, will validate it and help implement it. It will have a development committee. Board members will sit as influential members of the development council. Board members will participate, where appropriate, in committees on wills and bequests, and alumni relations, and corporate relations, and public relations, and so forth.

Yet, important as we know trustees to be, many of our institutions are today getting along with antiquated board structures and outmoded trustee bylaws. Too many boards were put together in terms of the needs of the college or university when it was founded in the nineteenth and sometimes the eighteenth century. Many boards of trustees aren't matched very well to the current needs of the college which they serve, though they may have been in the past. Too many boards don't reflect current thinking in terms of top management.

Because of their relative ineffectiveness in the past, trustees have often been bypassed in the plans for the growth of the institution in the present, yet thoughtful consideration suggests that the composition of the board of trustees, the involvement of its members, and the mobilization of its strength are essential to long term growth of a college or university.

Well, how would we proceed in putting together a board of trustees for a particular college. What are some of the factors which should be considered?

Three or four years ago I was much more of an expert than I am now; I would have given you a nice little formula. Now I believe that basic to success are not formulas and structures but the ability to surround the institution with people with dedication, intelligence, energy, general competence of thought and an immense amount of good will. No matter what else you find and where you find it, if you find these qualities you'll have a successful board.

Spirit and willingness will do wonders, of course, but there are some specific details we should examine as we define the kind of board that we should have for our institution - as we try to match the board to the institution -- to the needs of the institution.

Let's write a prescription in broad terms. Let's begin by considering the areas of general competence which should be represented.

First, we ought to have represented on the board a high degree of financial competence. I don't mean the small town banker

around the corner; I mean the man with vision about handling resources of substance, management of funds, relationships with financial institutions.

Second, we ought to have represented on the board, or close to it, considerable legal competence. I don't mean the small town lawyer; I mean the man with a broad knowledge of estate planning or a knowledge of where to go to get it -- the trends in law, the relationship between law and education.

Third, we ought to have higher education represented on the board. Many colleges now have a president from another institution serve on their board. He, better than the president, or you, can explain what academic freedom is all about when some crusty board member starts criticizing your economics department. And he will bring a fresh point of view to board deliberations on academic affairs.

Fourth, you ought to have government represented on your board. State colleges will often have too much government represented on the board. But private colleges might very well consider having a local government representative or someone who can interpret back and forth between the college and the community the needs of land acquisition, the relationship with municipal government, and so forth.

Fifth, you ought to have some top management competence on your board. This might be one or more successful men from business or from the management field itself.

And finally, there may be some specialties, germane to the particular field of interest of your institution, which should be represented. The engineering school will certainly have an engineer or two; the liberal arts college might have a literary figure. Certainly the coed or woman's college will have women on the board. And a woman's point of view might leaven any board, as a matter of fact.

What other specific things do you need in your board? In order to have effective interpretation and liaison with your various constituencies you might consider another dimension of diversity. I think perhaps you'd want to be sure that alumni are represented, not "alumni representatives," but broad gauge successful alumni of your institution on the board to represent that phase of the institution's background and history.

Certainly you ought to have some civic or social leadership on your board, if for no other reason than that it might represent one avenue into your special gifts area, but I'm thinking of it more realistically as an interpretation of this phase of our society.

You will need government, of course, as I mentioned.

You should have church representation, especially if you are a church related college; but I think perhaps the worst thing that can happen to you is to have a board composed exclusively of church representatives, unless you form a strong associate board of some kind to give you these other qualities.

You must have industry represented, and you will probably want to have at least one or two representatives of the professions.

What are some other considerations? Age! Age is a consideration. Other things being equal I think there should be some method of retiring people when their effectiveness is impaired by age. Senior members may become trustees emeriti, and continue sitting on the board without vote.

Another general consideration might be the geographical spread in order to provide insights into the problems of various areas. Certainly the national college, or the one aspiring to be national, should not have all of its trustees from the same area.

Now what are some qualities you would like to have in your board members? First, except in rare instances, clearly understood, you shouldn't accept a figurehead. Figureheads look awfully good, but a figurehead takes up just the same amount of chair space as an active board member. In the long run, the figurehead may actually operate to your detriment rather than your success. We should have trustees who have a consuming, sincere vital interest in higher education itself and are willing to make a personal commitment of some kind to the institution.

Each trustee should have a demonstrated competence in something, especially in trusteeship. The trustee should have a history of personal growth and of respect in his community and his profession.

Never accept a reluctant dragon -- this is a restatement of number one.

What conditions should be met in operating the board? There may not be any ready answer to this question, but we should be much more realistic than we are in following the rule of participate or get off. If we have to do this by writing it into our board constitution, let's push until we do it.

I don't think there is any rule which is inevitably good in terms of election or appointment of trustees, but somehow there must be built into the board a tradition of keeping competency forward. You know the dangers as well as I do: a self-perpetuating body tends toward mediocrity. It always has.

Somehow there should be built into the election or appointment procedure some way to screen people so that the old

timers don't just appoint their friends. They often appoint friends who won't be much competition to them. As this goes on year after year the board tends toward a very fine level of mediocre thinking. It may be fine for the president who's afraid of the board, but terrible for the institution which has aspirations for the future.

In short, I'm suggesting that, just as the successful institution analyzes each of its other assets and liabilities, just as it makes a careful evaluation of the means available to achieve its basic mission, its board of trustees must be examined in order to see whether or not the board in its composition, distribution of relationships and competencies, is the right board to carry the institution onward toward its goals.

As the examination is made, a formal prescription for the ideal board should be written, and plans undertaken to implement it.

If the institution has done its homework carefully in defining its case for existence, the areas where it proposes to serve, and its needs for growth, the prescription for the proper board of trustees will follow with little difficulty. The sections above suggest some of the considerations which may enter into the writing of the prescription.

Some institutions may approach the problem by calling in outside consultants, with board approval, to examine the whole area of trustee and administration relationships. Some will accomplish the task by honest and careful self-analysis, matching needs with resources.

By whatever means it is accomplished, or at whose behest, the creation of a competent board of trustees which is willing to take leadership and which is matched in its competencies and relationships to the needs of the institution is the bedrock of the institution's very hope of success.

PROFESSIONAL FUND RAISING COUNSEL

W. R. BROSSMAN

As we talk about professional fund raising counsel we confirm once more that there is little new under the sun.

Professional fund raising as a phenomenon goes back to the early days of our oldest colleges. In their formative days Harvard, William and Mary, Dartmouth and other colleges, including mine, employed professional fund raisers. They called them financial agents. These agents may have used different methods from ours of today, but their goals were the same. They were out to balance budgets, to create endowments and to fund buildings and other special projects. Often these men were ministers who would mount the pulpit on Sunday, preach fund raising sermons, then follow up with calls the next week. This breed survives today in some quarters.

Such financial agents were called upon when the president and the trustees had exhausted their fund raising capacities. (The responsibility of the president for fund raising has been recognized since colonial days. There is record that early in Yale's history the college went without a president for a period because it could find no person capable, or willing, to administer the institution and also raise funds.)

The financial agent was particularly active in the nineteenth century and the early days of the twentieth century. One of the best was Frederick T. Gates, who performed so well for John D. Rockefeller in behalf of the University of Chicago that he wound up as Rockefeller's financial adviser. Gates had his own techniques. He counseled solicitors to:

> "Dress well; see that your boots are polished, your hands clean and your hair well brushed.
>
> "Provide yourself with an elegant personal card.
>
> "On entering, go straight to your subject without palaver.
>
> "Let the victim talk freely."

Modern fund raising technique and the fund raising firm as we know it today trace back some seventy years to a pair of gentlemen named Pierce and Ward. Both were YMCA secretaries, charged with the financial burdens as well as the other responsibilities of their jobs. Pierce became disturbed because so much of his time was being consumed by fund raising. He proceeded to enlist 100 of the leading men of Omaha and gave each an assignment: to find one member a month

until the membership quota had been met. The men were divided into teams, the inevitable printed material was prepared and regular report meetings were held. It was a great success--Arnaud Marts comments that it was also fun--and news of the successful experiment speedily got around.

Let us shift the scene to Ward and Grand Rapids, Michigan. His idea was to get his directors to close their desks for a month and see a set number of prospects each day. He promised that if they would do this, nothing more would be said or done about finances the rest of the year. This novel undertaking worked and Ward soon found himself on the road to spread the virtues of the technique to other cities.

It was inevitable that the two, Pierce and Ward, should get together. They combined forces in a campaign for a YMCA building in Washington. Pierce decided to cut the campaign down to a week of intensive activity involving a great corps of volunteers. Again it worked, and so the intensive campaign was born. Hospitals, college and welfare societies took notice. Things haven't changed too much since. (According to Marts, the University of Pittsburgh can claim a first among colleges in using the new technique. That was in 1914. Pitt was in transition from the old Western University of Pennsylvania and moving its campus from Allegheny to the present site in the Oakland district of the

Just as it was inevitable that Pierce and Ward should get together, so it was foreordained that they should recognize they had something to sell. So the first fund raising firm was formed in 1919--Ward, Wells, Pierce and Wells. Some of the well-known firms of today (Marts & Lundy, Tamblyn & Brown, for example) are offshoots of that pioneer organization.

The fund raising field is far from sparsely settled today, and professional firms appear to be steadily growing in number. The best-known firms are those which are members of the American Association of Fund-Raising Counsel, Inc., with offices in New York. These are experienced firms with generally solid records of success. Together they subscribe to a fair practice code which attempts to curb some of the abuses which have sometimes accompanied fund raising practices.

These firms serve only organizations whose purpose and methods they can endorse.

They do business only on the basis of a specified fee, determined before a campaign begins. They do not work on commission or percentage.

The executive head of each of these firms must have had at least a six-year record of continuous experience as a professional in the fund raising field.

These firms look with disfavor on organizations which make exaggerated claims of past achievements, guarantee results or promise to obtain unobtainable sums.

Broadly speaking, the professional fund raising firm offers two kinds of service: counseling and campaign direction.

Counseling has to do with public relations aspects of fund raising, with long-range planning, and the like. Practically any kind of counseling is available, and financial compensation to the firm will be a matter of negotiation according to the specific situation.

Campaign direction is what the term implies--direct management of a campaign. We are talking about capital campaigns as the professional firm will not as a result concern itself with annual fund appeals.

Someone has described the fund raising firm as a specialized kind of employment service which can put specialized people on a specialized job. Perhaps we might think of these firms as the Kelly Girl enterprises of educational finance.

What are the advantages of counsel? They are many, and these are some of them:

The experienced fund raising firm can call on its experience to demonstrate that something probably will or will not work. There is always someone to come up with the idea that 1000 persons giving $1000 apiece will do the job in fine shape. The fund raising firm can stop that sort of nonsense in a hurry.

The fund raising firm can establish due dates and see that they are met.

It can provide extra manpower for short periods.

It can ramrod the president and the trustees.

It can set up the delicate and pivotal matter of solicitation of the board of trustees itself.

It can run sales schools for volunteer canvassers.

It can provide literature, record forms and techniques, publicity and the rest.

And--most important--because the firm's services are costing money, it can convince the college that the meter is running and that to dally is to waste dollars.

Counseling can take many shapes but we are primarily concerned here with the capital campaign. At the outset most professional fund raising firms will insist on what is called a survey. A survey can cost a little or a lot, but in normal cases a one-man survey might run close to $1000 a week per man. Typically the survey will last from four to six weeks and encompass the interviewing of 50 to 100 persons sampled from the institution's constituency. The objective is to see how that constituency feels about the college and whether it will work and give.

(Surveys can run into money in unusual circumstances. In the case of one small college on the West Coast, a nationally conducted survey occupied two men for several months and cost about $20,000.)

What sort of questions does the survey man ask? Here are the questions that one firm uses:

> What is the person's attitude toward the administration and function of the college?
>
> Does the person approve the proposed fund raising campaign?
>
> Will he make a subscription?
>
> Will he work?

The firm I am citing estimates the individual's degree of interest and scores the interviewee as enthusiastic, warm, uninformed, apathetic or opposed.

The survey also attempts to determine if the college has a well-managed business operation and an organizational structure which can carry the fund raising load. It looks also for specific needs which can be demonstrated.

If the public attitude is favorable and the other factors check out, the survey is reported affirmatively and the campaign is set to proceed.

The timetable is likely to be an extended one if the fund raising firm is called in at the very genesis of the campaign. The firm should be called in before the trouble starts and before it is too late to change basic concepts. The fund raiser likes to think of himself as a professional who should be engaged at the beginning, just as an architect would be called in to plan from the start and not summoned just before groundbreaking.

Once the arrangement to hire professional counsel is made, the college can help itself by getting ready for the arrival of the campaign director and his associates. A liaison man is

essential--someone from the college staff who can help in gathering material, opening doors around the campus, and helping to see that things go smoothly. There will be much to do. The college can further help by organizing its fund raising records and histories, by preparing biography and personality sketches of the trustees and principal officers of the college, by expediting visual materials if buildings are involved, and by arranging office space. As someone has put it, the fund raising counselor is the sales manager of the campaign; he needs room and people with which to work. There will be assignments enough to go around: lists, leaflets, pledge cards, report envelopes, forms, publicity, the inevitable kickoff convocation, records, followup systems, pledge collection procedures, and many more.

Now what will this fund raising service cost? It depends of course on local circumstances, the geographical terrain to be covered, the dimensions of the campaign, other factors. The principal items in any campaign, however, will boil down to professional fees and attendant out-of-pocket costs of printing, dinners, etc. Costs will vary widely but there are some rules of thumb.

It used to be said that the cost of engaging a firm was roughly equivalent to borrowing the sought-for sum for a year. Two years might be more like it today.

One firm cites costs of raising money out of its experience as:

> for men's colleges, 4.4 percent of the objective.
>
> for coeducational colleges, 8.7 percent of the objective.
>
> for theological seminaries, 16 percent of the objective.

Another of the firms was good enough to give me a confidential list of charges for a dozen recent campaigns. Here is what it showed:

> Campaign A--an intensive community campaign for a private university in Indiana--$173,000 pledged at a cost of $20,894 (12 percent).
>
> Campaign B--an area alumni campaign for an urban university in Michigan--$500,759 pledged at a cost of $83,743 (17 percent).
>
> Campaign C--an intensive community campaign for a small private college in Indiana--$664,822 raised at a cost of $27,037 (4 percent).

Campaign D--a first-phase development program for a private urban university in Indiana--$1,368,059 raised at a cost of $125,903 (9 percent).

Campaign E--a four-year, first-phase development program for a small private college in Michigan--$2,162,668 raised at a cost of $159,570 (7 percent).

Campaign F--a four-year development program for a small private college in Michigan--$4,469,071 raised at a cost of $160,208 (3 percent).

Campaign G--a first-phase development program for a private college in North Dakota--$569,039 raised at a cost of $114,039 (20 percent).

Campaign H--an intensive community campaign for a small private college in Nebraska--$56,184 raised at a cost of $13,418 (23 percent).

Campaign I--a community development program for a municipal university in Florida--$1,084,144 raised at a cost of $73,435 (7 percent).

Campaign J--a community development program for a small private university in Ohio--$480,492 raised at a cost of $38,187 (8 percent).

Campaign K--an intensive community campaign for a state teachers college in Indiana--$1,210,000 raised at a cost of $48,824 (4 percent).

Campaign L--a first-phase development program for a small private college in Ohio--$595,000 raised at a cost of $116,576 (19 percent).

It is plain that fund raising expense runs proportionately more in smaller campaigns. As the old Pullman joke used to go, the lower is higher than the upper.

Just how do you go about selecting counsel? The American Association of Fund-Raising Counsel will gladly offer advice. Word-of-mouth recommendations from other colleges are perhaps as helpful as anything. Fund raising firms have their vogues--Kersting Brown has enjoyed especial celebrity recently in the Harvard and other big campaigns, and sometimes this is a helpful indicator.

Above all, it is a good precaution to find out all you can about the campaign director who will be assigned to your campaign. Did he do a good job in his recent assignments? Did he

have a sensitivity to campus problems and the subtleties of the local setting? Did he run a strong-arm campaign which will make it difficult to work with alumni and others over the long pull?

With fund raising service in heavy demand, some ill-prepared fund raising counselors are abroad. Jim Hardie of Case Institute of Technology tells of the neophyte campaign director he encountered during his own days with a professional firm. The young man had a terrible problem and needed Hardie's advice right away: his campaign was just about to begin and one of the volunteers had given the entire sum needed by himself! Experience is a good thing to look for in a campaign director.

If you are like we were at Colorado College when we talked about our current Colorado College Campaign, you might decide that you want to go it alone. There may be circumstances when this is a sensible course. We thought it was in ours.

Colorado College had had a background of two unsuccessful campaigns conducted by professional counsel.

We felt sure no firm would have permitted us to undertake the $6,000,000 campaign we needed.

We wanted to do some things in unconventional ways, operating with a small staff and attempting some new approaches in literature.

We wanted to keep costs to a minimum.

So we decided to go it alone. We have. We think we have been moderately successful. (We are at the $4,500,000 mark.)

Would we do it again? We know that a professional firm would have helped us to organize better and would have kept us closer to the task. We know a professional firm would have done a better job of planning the campaign in distant areas. We know a professional firm would have done a better job of yardsticking for the smaller giver. On balance I suspect there is a fair chance we would retain counsel another time.

One of the current phenomena is the rise of the fund raising counselor who provides counsel and nothing more. No campaign direction for this kind of counselor. Some are oldtimers--the highly respected Cy Seymour, Gonser and Gerber, Paul Davis. The American College Public Relations Association can offer the names of consultants who are practicing in the college field exclusively. Fund Fulfillment is one of the new names--an organization concerned with financial planning as well as fund raising. There are even such specialized outfits such as Jobson Associates which is prepared to be an institution's representative in New York, helping to arrange appointments with foundations,

staging press conferences, obtaining publicity. Such counselors can be useful, but they should be chosen with care and carefully referenced with other institutions which employ their services.

Let me close with a few observations:

1. If you are choosing a fund raising firm, choose a stable one. The fund raising professionals are restless and splitoffs are common. Be sure that the firm you hire today will be in business tomorrow.

2. Campaigns seem to be changing, as Brakeley notes. Campaigns are becoming longer and more dollars are coming from a smaller and smaller percentage of the donors. Despite this, we might wonder why the basic asking unit is still the $150 "share" that was the basic asking unit twenty years ago.

3. Don't let a professional firm hold you back. There is still room for innovation and boldness in this business.

4. Remember that the fund raising firm won't do any fund raising. Your own alumni, trustees and other friends are still going to have to get out and ring doorbells. The firm will help you to make the right appeal to the right people at the right time, but the matter of getting down to cases is still up to you.

5. The trend of course is to more and bigger fund raising. This offers a challenge to everyone connected with education to use every resource to see that the job is done with intelligence, the highest ethics and a concern for the fund raisers who will have to retrace the ground in other years. We in education, and those in professional fund raising, can learn from one another and work together to make sure that higher education remains the end and not the means.

ACTION: PUTTING INTO EFFECT DEVELOPMENT KNOWLEDGE

JAMES W. JACKSON, JR.

Two criticisms of institutes, workshops, conventions, conferences and meetings by the people in ACPRA, the American Alumni Council and similar organizations, have been 1) that the speakers were too philosophical and didn't get down to the how-to, and 2) the speakers who presented the case study and told "how-to," "weren't talking about my institution and what they said doesn't apply to me and so I got nothing from it." So you really can't win, must take your pick of the two criticisms, draw your own conclusions and obtain what information you can.

The purpose of this presentation is to depart as much as possible from the leisure of the theory class and get into a plan of action. This plan is not going to fit anyone, but I hope you can draw from it successfully.

First of all let's review what has gone on at the institute, for what we have been doing all week is drawing a plan of action.

The definition of a successful development program

Francis C. Pray's: A program is successful when it has "identified, informed and stirred to action all of those persons who can make a significant contribution to the chosen mission of the institution."

Don Smith's: "Justified, dignified, organized asking within an environment of understanding and respect."

The statement of the case

This is the justification process, justifying your request for support from any constituency. I think we agree that we need this before starting, that it must be genuine and it must be sincere. It should also be comprehensive, as in the case of the Hofstra College statement referred to by Fran Pray.

Alumni

Alumni giving and the alumni program are a vital part of our institution's program, and we are cautioned not to overestimate their importance. Our appeals for support should be dignified, not cute. There is a question whether or not we can afford to wear ourselves out with organized, regional, personal solicitation among alumni every year. We might do well to consider the pledge system in all alumni giving, and certainly we should measure our potential before going on an all-out effort with alumni or any other constituency.

Special Prospects

Special prospects for the most part will contribute ninety per cent of our gift potential; ninety per cent of our gift support will come from ten per cent of our constituents and perhaps fifty per cent from one per cent. These special prospects must be handled in a special way; we cannot have too much information on them in our records; we must not hurry them unreasonably, although sometimes it helps to speed action; we must find the particular field of interest of the prospect, within our institution, and seek the best way to involve the prospect in that field and stir him to action. Communication must be personal, as noted by Bernie Taylor in his illustration that you can't write to a cow and you can't talk to a cow...you have to sit down beside her and go to work.

Estate Planning

The estate planning field is vastly undeveloped; this is where the special prospects, particularly, can benefit simply by acquiring the knowledge of how best they can give. Very few in this work can ever become authorities in estate planning and we do need professional help, but we must become versed in fundamentals that we can point out to prospects various channels of giving through estate planning.

Corporate Support

Corporate support is going up for almost all institutions. We can usually look in our own area and find the greatest support. The exciting new Cleveland Compact idea may reach the entire country with its benefits for education, particularly if the bandwagon continues to build. Corporations give, to a great extent, with enlightened self interest, and we should know why any particular corporation should give to our institution. Therefore, we must have a clear statement of the case for corporations. It is encouraging to realize after surveying corporate support that corporations have supported those institutions that have made the best case in the best way, regardless of size, type, religious affiliation or history.

Records

Perhaps there are no really good records systems among institutions. They can be, but need not be, costly in time and in money, as far as the development program is concerned. A records system must be planned with the same care, the same long range view that the total development is planned. Records require continual maintenance, and a good records system is vital to a coordinated and successful development program.

Trustees

Trustees can make or break development programs and development officers as well as institutions. Yet few institutions have strong boards of trustees. If a board is weak, it is possible to get around the weakness, if not possible to change the current board, by forming a development council, a board of visitors, an associates group, or a similar organization. Regardless of its name, board of trustees, council, associates or visitors, it must be a working, informed, enlightened body representing a variety of professions and interests.

Faculty and Students

We must keep faculty and students informed. They can and should be involved in the planning and even the administration of the total development program. There are a number of excellent success stories in this area. Under the development concept, every member of every institution is a part of the total development program and has a responsibility for it. Heeding the words of Gould, we must take the time to know higher education, to know our own institution, and to speak the same language as the faculty, that we may earn its respect.

Foundations

Foundations may be overrated as a source of support for most institutions, but can't be overlooked. Foundations are people, and should be treated as people. Foundation representatives will normally say they have little money to give away, and plenty of opportunities for so doing. Their task is to allocate gifts in the most effective way according to the charter of the foundation and the policy of its officers. We should, therefore, know all that can be learned about the foundation before requesting money of it. The Foundation Library Center at 444 Madison Avenue, New York City, has accumulated a vast amount of material about foundations, and can furnish information on books which tell how to prepare a foundation proposal. After visiting the library, if doubt still remains about a foundation's program and policy, a letter to the foundation asking for such information will normally bring an informative response.

Professional Counsel

We are and have been in for the past decade a transitional era in higher education, particularly in fund raising. This transitional era has seen fund raising guidelines change, with subsequent confusion, discontent and strained relations between institution and professional counsel. However, it is unquestioned that professional fund raising firms have time-proven, effective methods of raising money. These methods won't necessarily work for a given institution, nor will they necessarily fail. Two general types of counsel service are offered today: (1) periodic consulting or counseling, and

(2) campaign direction and management. Regardless of the firm or method used in raising funds, it is the people, of institutions as well as of firms, who determine success or failure.

- - -

We have reviewed these discussions because such a review and putting it down on paper is the first step in a plan of action. We must correlate principles, ideas, cases and factors for our own institution's plan. Following this, most of us face a dilemma: we know we must plan for a long range program, but we are pressured to raise immediate funds. We recognize that crash programs are dangerous, draining time, energy and budget, but they control our programs more often than not.

What then, is the answer? There is no pat answer, but one might proceed as follows:

1. Start long range planning on a scheduled basis. Write a <u>temporary</u> long range plan, labelling it as such, for both the institution and the development program.

2. <u>Try</u> to prevent immediate demands for funds from wrecking long range plans and principles; maintain equilibrium.

3. Get what records are available in order, making certain they are accurate. Launch the mechanism for insuring accuracy, continuing evaluation and expanding records.

4. As soon as possible, immediately, find at least three objectives for gift support within the institution that most people will agree on and that will certainly fit into a long range plan of development. Consider four areas from which to draw these three objectives. Buildings, because some people would rather give to buildings; books; scholarships; and faculty salaries; all of which are receiving attention and recognition, and all of which have particular appeal to particular people.

5. Get commitments from those who are responsible for support of the immediate and the long range program. Look first to the board of trustees; hopefully, responsibility and capability will be there. Immediately try to identify those ten to fifteen people who will spell success or failure, both for the short range program and for the long range program. As far as gifts are concerned, the people may be the same or

they may be different. Measure the potential from all sources -- alumni, community, foundations, parents, corporations -- try to find in each one of these groups the one per cent who will give fifty per cent, the ten per cent who will give ninety per cent. Concentrate on the top ten per cent within each constituency.

6. Try to determine what to do within all areas of institutional development. Maybe there are fifty such areas, but plans should be down on paper. Not necessarily <u>when</u>, but <u>what</u> we will strive to do in each of these areas.

7. Let the internal constituencies know what we're doing --- not everything, perhaps, but at least as much as they want to know. For faculty, students, the trustees, the alumni, the parents and community -- establish the mechanism for getting this done. Start immediately winning faculty support, even though it appears that time could best be spent by going on the road and asking for money. Perhaps we should budget time toward knowing the institution department by department, and knowing higher education. We don't have to be Ph.D.'s to do it; we have to have the capability of rising to the position that Fran Pray feels most institutions will ultimately have, because this is in the future and we are in the present. But we do have to have faculty support, knowledge of the institution and knowledge of higher education to make this program successful.

8. Start immediately with a communication program to all constituencies. Start with a newsletter -- not necessarily a magazine, but a simple information piece. It need not try to tell people how to give or why to give, but can encourage support through interesting, informative and factual stories about <u>higher</u> education at our institution.

9. Try to become so well versed in development and in what the institution is doing that we can use our own judgment with confidence, and make our own decisions in development with confidence, using outside help if it is best but making the ultimate decisions ourselves.

A Case Study: The Backward Calendar

As I qualified it by saying, a case study and plan won't apply to most people. But I am assuming that this college can't wait, that before July 1 of 1962 it will need $300,000 in gifts toward operating funds, and $700,000 for a new library and classroom building. It just can't wait any longer on this; it's not ready but it can't wait.

So how do we start? We paint a dream with our objectives and then we establish a timetable that is realistic. Starting with the objectives of July 1, 1962, work backward from that, back to the current day.

The Backward Calendar

July 1, 1962. for Hypothetical University. $1,000,000 raised. Re-check of the records and the gift range table which was established in the fall. Evaluation of what has been done and how it could have been done better.

June 1, 1962. Meet with Board at special call meeting held in conjunction with Commencement. Go to the top leadership of the board and make sure that they give and pledge enough to put the campaign over the top. Resolicit some. Make sure that all special prospects for the year have been solicited. Announce progress at commencement.

May 1, 1962. Establish priorities for the special prospects calls to be made during that month. Send out a newsletter to inform the constituencies of what's going on. Meet with faculty and students. Check all gifts that have come in the preceding year; make sure that they have all been thanked and followed-up properly. Check with the volunteer leaders on May 1 and May 15 to make sure they have met their deadlines in reporting gifts. Do this either by letter, telephone or personal communication.

April 1, 1962. Establish priorities for special prospects calls during the month of April. Launch the intensive and public effort for this million dollars. Announce at this time that $400,000 has already been received in gifts and pledges. Call a special meeting of the board for commencement week. Mail kits to volunteer leaders by April 15, making sure that these kits contain materials and a plan which is dignified, shows justification and is in keeping with the objectives of the institution. Meet with faculty and students.

March 1, 1962. Prepare for the March 15 meeting of the board, when the first report of the long range planning committee will be presented. Prepare a progress report on the year's activities for the board of trustees, and lay it on the line to the board that it is up to them to see that this million dollar effort

goes over. Get out a newsletter to all the constituencies giving the progress toward the objectives that have been established for the year. Establish priorities for special prospect calls during March. Meet with faculty and students. Evaluate the year's plans and change if necessary.

February 1, 1962. Attend district meeting of ACPRA to exchange views with other people and cry on at least ten shoulders. Determine the extent of the volunteer group you can properly service and use during the intensive effort of April and May. Prepare a kit for volunteer leaders with instructions and materials to carry through the entire effort. Establish priority for special prospect calls to be made during the month of February. Meet with faculty and students.

January 1, 1962. Count money. Thank those properly who have pledged $300,000. Profit by the action of a college president who, when he received $100,000 from a man who was evaluated for far more, thanked him properly and also said, "of course you understand that this does not disinfect you." Report progress to the board of trustees, and check again the gift range table which has been established. Review visits and the solicitation of the special prospects to date. Establish priorities for visits to be made during the month of January. Rewrite the year's plan which you have written earlier in the year.

December 1, 1961. Quietly, with dignity, see the sources likely to make larger end of year gifts to benefit from tax laws. Inform constituencies about taxes and philanthropy, perhaps by sending the Lasser Tax Institute booklet, which costs about nine cents per copy. Report to the board and other leaders the progress of the months to date. Meet with faculty and students. Establish priority for special calls.

November 1, 1961. Rework your year's plan. Establish priority for special calls. Solicit, during November, past donors quietly, confidentially, asking them to help you identify other sources of support. Make sure that these calls are made by the right person. Prepare a mailing for alumni, corporations, community, parents, etc. that justifies your objectives, that is dignified and informative, perhaps including a return envelope and a pledge card. Meet with faculty and students. Continue long range planning.

October 1, 1961. Prepare for the trustees meeting on October 15. Get a chairman for the year's fund raising effort. Know what you are going to do or what is to be done at the meeting of the board, which will include solicitation of gifts, commitment to gifts, and the asking of others to give. Obtain commitments from friends or leaders or both on the board in advance. Get out the first newsletter of the year to all constituencies, announcing objectives but not necessarily dollar objectives. Prepare a gift range table on the basis of the evaluation of prospects, particularly

the board. Meet with faculty and other officers and find out which of them will be traveling through the year, and perhaps can serve as ambassadors when they are out of the city. Establish your library on estate planning and find your authority.

September 1, 1961. Complete the identification phase, or at least the start of the identification phase. Know who the top ten per cent are in each constituency. Know who the leaders are. Make sure that records, at least the ones which are on hand, are accurate, and establish the mechanism for continuing through the year.

August 1, 1961. Draw the backward calendar. Prepare a temporary statement of the case, or statement of simple mission prepared, perhaps written by you. Label it a temporary statement and start taking steps to make it a comprehensive and thorough statement. Lay foundations for accomplishing a long range plan and know what the essential elements will be. Evaluate your institution coldly and analytically. Get a commitment from the president that he will meet with you and you alone every week for at least two or three hours, and that he will spend a specific number of days every month making, or helping to make, fund raising calls.

This, of course, is not a comprehensive plan and omits many articles, many hours that will be demanded of you. But it could highlight what one hypothetical institution will seek to do, and will perhaps provide a base from which we can seek our own plan of action.